

JPRS 77984

4 May 1981

China Report

RED FLAG

No. 6, 17 March 1981

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

4 May 1981

CHINA REPORT

RED FLAG

No. 6, 17 March 1981

Translation of the semimonthly theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party published in Beijing.

CONTENTS

How To Appraise the Current Economic Situation (pp 2-7) (Contributing commentator).....	1
On Making Strenuous Efforts To Increase the Production of Consumer Goods (pp 8-12) (Song Jiwen).....	10
A Look at the Relationship Between Accumulation and Consumption (pp 13-20) (Yang Bo).....	18
Correctly Understand the Historical Experience of the Paris Commune--In Commemoration of the 110th Anniversary of the Paris Commune (pp 21-26) (Li Yuanming).....	31
Build Spiritual Civilization by Promoting the 'Five Stresses' and the 'Four Beautifuls' (pp 27-29) (Guan Xin).....	41
The Social Responsibility of Writers and the Social Effects of Their Works (pp 30-35, 7) (Wei Jianlin).....	46
A Guide To Uniting the Intellectuals--Studying the Expositions on the Question of Intellectuals in Volume 1 of the 'Selected Works of Zhou Enlai' (pp 36-39) (Zhu Tongshun).....	55

Uphold Democratic Centralism (pp 40-45)	
(Zhu Gu).....	62
Learn From Lenin's Exemplary Work Style of Correctly	
Handling Differing Views Within the Party (pp 44-48)	
(Wu Liping).....	69
Conscientiously Implement the Policy of Letting the	
Peasants Keep Private Plots on Hillsides for Gathering	
Firewood (p 49)	
(Li Zhankui).....	76

HOW TO APPRAISE THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 pp 2-7

[Article by contributing commentator]

[Text] 1. The Economic Situation Is Very Good

The current economic situation is very good. Rarely has the situation been so good as it is now since the founding of the People's Republic. Why are we saying this?

In studying the economic situation, the first thing we study is the condition of production development. The growth rate of industrial production in 1979 and 1980 of 8.5 percent and 8.4 percent respectively is slightly lower than that of 1977 and 1978 (14.3 percent and 13.5 percent). However, the high growth rate of 1977 and 1978 is misleading. Of the many things produced, a considerable portion which turned out to be unsuitable for the market was stored away in warehouses. Moreover, as in the past, no attention was paid to the people's daily necessities and light industry had to make way for heavy industry. Consequently, the greater the development, the greater the imbalance. In 1979 and 1980, because attention was paid in the formulation of plans not to set high targets and because heavy industry had to make way for light industry, 1979 was more realistic than the 2 previous years and 1980 was even more down-to-earth than 1979.

In 1979, there was already a change from the common practice of the past, and the rate of development of light industry exceeded that of heavy industry. In 1980, the growth of heavy industry was only 1.6 percent whereas the growth of light industry was 17.4 percent. This development is more in line with conditions in China. In 1978, as a result of the correction of leftist mistakes, agricultural production increased by 9 percent in a single year and increased by another 8.6 percent in 1978, making 2 years of high-speed development in a row. In 1980, although we had drought in the north and flooding in the south seldom experienced for scores of years, we still obtained quite a good harvest in grain production. The estimated total grain output of about 316 million tons is only slightly less than 1979, the second record year since the founding of the People's Republic. Such cash crops as cotton, sugar and oil-bearing crops all showed increased production to reach the highest level in history, and the gross output value of agriculture is still slightly higher than 1979. The internal proportion of agriculture is also more rational.

Second, let us study the living conditions of the people. In the latter part of 1978, the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee decided to cut back the scale of capital construction, raise the purchase price for agricultural products, further improve the wages of the workers following the wage improvement in 1977 and increase the awarding of bonuses. The original plan called for cutting back 9 billion yuan in capital investment, improving wages and raising the purchase price to increase the income of workers and peasants by 10 billion yuan (not including the portion resulting from increasing the wages of workers and increasing the amount of agricultural products purchased). The result of implementation was that the cutback in capital construction investment could not be fulfilled according to plan, and because of the increase of investments outside the plan, total investment was still slightly higher than in 1978 (increased from 48 billion yuan to 50 billion yuan). Improvement of wages and raising of the purchase price however exceeded the original plan and amounted to over 14 billion yuan. During these years, there was a great increase in social purchasing power, or in other words, the income of urban and rural people greatly increased. From 1970 to 1979, social purchasing power on the average increased by 8.4 billion yuan a year. In 1978, it increased to 14.8 billion yuan. In 1979, it increased to 32.2 billion yuan. Preliminary estimates in 1980 showed that it again increased to 35.4 billion yuan. The amount of increase of social purchasing power is on the whole equivalent to the amount of increase in national income. In other words, almost the whole of the national income in these 2 years has been used to improve the life of the people. At present, the average income of a farmer has risen from 117 yuan in 1977 to 170 yuan in 1980 (an increase of 45 percent in 3 years). The average wage of a worker has increased from 602 yuan in 1977 to 781 yuan in 1980 (an increase of 30 percent in 3 years). Last year, the bonuses and subsidies received by workers in many enterprises were on the whole equivalent to 2 months' pay and for workers in departments equivalent to 1 month's pay. Now, what people are queuing up to buy is not ordinary food-stuffs but all kinds of quality goods. At the same time, savings deposits in banks have also greatly increased.

Between production growth rate and improving people's life, which is the essential hallmark for judging the quality of the economic situation? Naturally, developing production is the prerequisite for improving the life of the people. However, in the history of our country, we have always only paid attention to the rate of production development and not to improving the life of the people. Therefore, the quality of the economic situation must primarily be judged from the condition of the life of the people, and particularly the peasants who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population. In history, we have had two periods of high-speed development. One was the 3 years of recovery after the founding of the People's Republic. The average growth of industrial production at that time was 34.8 percent and the growth of agricultural production was 14.1 percent a year. However, this was in the nature of recovery. After the 3 years, the war-ravaged national economy was able to top all previous records. At that time, our foundation was still very fragile. Although there had been a great improvement, it was still very far behind in comparison with conditions at present. In 1952, the supply system was still practiced and even departmental cadres could not afford a wristwatch. In 1954, when the wage system was implemented, they still could not afford a tube-type radio (there were still no

semiconductor radios at that time). Now, almost all the workers have a wrist-watch and some have also bought their own television sets. During the first 5-year plan, the production growth rate was also very fast. Industrial production yearly increased by 18 percent and agricultural production by 4.5 percent. There was also a marked improvement in the life of the people. The superiority of socialism was clearly manifested at that time, and people had infinite faith in it. However, this was not the case with the second high-speed development. In the so-called 3 years' Great Leap Forward which began in 1958, the average growth of heavy industry was 49 percent and the average growth of light industry was 14 percent a year. However, agricultural production fell and there was a marked deterioration in the life of the people. Naturally, this was not an excellent situation but a very bad one. In the 20 years from 1957 to 1976, apart from the period of readjustment (from 1961 to 1965), because of the yearly emphasis on high speed, the capital construction front became greatly over-extended. Consequently, despite the relatively fast growth in industrial production, there was little improvement in the life of the people. Although they yearly said that the "situation was good," actually the situation in many years was not good at all. The growth rate of industrial production in the last 2 years has not been as good as many years in the past, but there has been a definite improvement in the life of the people. In particular, there is a marked improvement in the life of the 800 million peasants. In this sense, rarely has the situation been so good as now since the founding of the People's Republic. Naturally, this is only the beginning. In the future, the situation will get better and better.

The reason we say that the situation is very good and rarely has the situation been as good as now since the founding of the People's Republic is not only because of the growth in production and the improvement in the life of the people at present, but more importantly, because we have started to correct "leftist" mistakes and break away from the serious imbalance in proportion. During the last decades, because we have not carried out economic construction based on national conditions in China but have blindly gone in for high speed, we have seriously dislocated the proportions of the national economy. Normal proportionate relations cannot be restored in just 1 or 2 years. Although we have called for readjusting the policy of the national economy for 2 years, because many of the comrades do not fully understand and have not effectively carried this out, consequently results have not been very good. Before old difficulties are surmounted, new difficulties emerge. Last year, the central work conference put forward a plan which is more suited to the actual circumstances for further readjusting the national economy. It pointed out that the scale of capital construction is still too big, the proportionate relations between agriculture, light industry and heavy industry are still not coordinated while energy, communications and transportation still cannot keep in step with the existing scale of production and construction. Therefore, not only must we continue to cut back capital construction this year, but we must also voluntarily lower the production growth rate of some departments, develop less heavy industry and develop more agricultural and light industry. Due to the huge amount of financial deficits and the rise in prices which to a certain extent is caused by them, we have no alternative but to also strictly control improvement of the people's life. Otherwise, the plan for improving the life of the people

will fail. In short, we must still take a difficult and tortuous path in the process of readjusting. However, as long as we chart a correct course, we will be able to pass through the dangerous shoals and continue our advance. Therefore, it is not enough to judge the excellent situation simply by the changes in production and life during the past 2 years. The more important thing is that our minds have become more conscious and we are beginning to correct "leftist" mistakes, making the effort to change from passivity into regaining the initiative and seeing the really promising future.

2. There Are Serious Difficulties in the Excellent Situation

We have on the one hand said that the situation is excellent, but on the other hand, we have also said that there are serious difficulties. How can this be actually explained? Naturally, the root cause of the difficulties has been caused by the "leftist" mistakes accumulated over the past 20 years or more and by the 10 years of turmoil of the "Great Cultural Revolution" which brought the national economy to the verge of collapse. After the smashing of the "gang of four," instead of promptly correcting the "leftist" mistakes, we made a call in 1977 for basically accomplishing the mechanization of agriculture by 1980 and again made a call in 1978 for getting started and going all out in industry. In that year, because appropriations for state capital construction increased by more than 40 percent over the previous year and because of the introduction of an enormous amount of complete sets of equipment from abroad, the disproportion was further revealed. The 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee in the winter of 1978 and the central work conference in the spring of 1979 promptly put forward the eight-character policy centered around readjustment and the whole-sale correcting of "leftist" mistakes began. The central work conference called for cutting back capital construction investments in that year from 45 billion yuan to 36 billion yuan and using the money saved to raise the purchasing price of agricultural products and increase the wages of workers. There had been little improvement in the life of the people for 20 years, and although the extent of the rise in purchasing price and increase in wages was quite a bit bigger, this actually was necessary. As mentioned before, the problem was that because many of the comrades saw the very good economic situation (this being just the opposite of the readjustment in the early period of the 1960's), they failed to see the necessity of readjusting and therefore did not exert themselves in this respect, neither did they cut back on the scale of capital construction. Moreover, they even topped the predetermined plan in the extent of improving the life of the people. Consequently, financial deficits appeared, and by 1980 prices could no longer be stabilized.

When preparing the plan for 1980, we paid attention to this problem and that was why we made a further cut in capital construction investments from 36 billion yuan to 24 billion in the plan. However, this again failed to produce the anticipated result. Because the localities and enterprises have a bit of flexible financial resources, investments outside the plan greatly increased. Moreover, they have gone in for redundant and wasteful construction resulting in the small squeezing out the big and the new forcing out the old. The wages of the workers increased by 40 percent in 1979, but because of the length of time required for grading, they were only paid retroactively in the summer and fall of 1980. In that year,

they also increased the distribution of bonuses and subsidies, and the amount of the bonus paid by many enterprises was on the whole equivalent to a general promotion of one grade for the low salaried workers. In that year, there was very little increase in the planned purchase price for commodities. However, many of the communes and production brigades reduced the basic amount of requisition and assignment purchases and increased the price of "excess quota purchase" by 50 percent. Many of the communes and production brigades also sold negotiated price grain and other agricultural products even higher than this price. Just the price increase for excess quota purchase and negotiated price purchase of grain was more than 5 billion yuan. Most of these commodities purchased at a high price were sold at a low price on the market, and the state subsidy for commodity prices amounted to 20 billion yuan. After a freeze of 20 years, there are definitely many difficulties in the life of the people. It is fully understandable for the departments concerned to take an interest in the life of the workers and peasants. The problem is, the purchasing power of the people has increased by over 30 billion yuan a year for 2 years in a row. This is not only more than public finance can bear but has also exceeded the increase in production.

In 1976, national income increased by 6.9 percent (based on the unchanged value), the supply of social commodities increased by 15 percent (based on the value of that year), whereas social purchasing power increased by 20 percent. We have still not received the statistics on the national income for 1980, but we estimate that conditions will be roughly the same as in 1979. Financial deficits in 1980 will also be well above the schedule. Therefore, there was an increase in the prices of many commodities last year.

In order to eliminate financial deficits, control the amount of currency issued and insure the stability of the market and commodity prices, the CCP Central Committee has decided to resolutely cut back capital construction investments this year and also to correspondingly cut down on spending in other directions. Recently, the whole country has been generally discussing the readjustment plan and may possibly cut back the amount of investments. The question is, should we also appropriately control improving the life of the people? Some of the comrades are of the opinion that we should continue to raise the wage level and generally hand out bonuses. Some hold that in order to provide an incentive for agriculture to increase production, we must continue to raise the purchasing price for agricultural products. Judging from a partial point of view, such views are reasonable. However, judging from the situation as a whole, the handing out of bonuses (or subsidies) to compensate for the increase in prices and the issuing of more money will on the other hand stimulate an increase in commodity prices. In raising the purchasing price of agricultural products, if we maintain the stability of the market price, the subsidy of commodity prices will go up faster. This will increase financial deficits and make the rise in commodity prices even harder to control. If there is a drastic rise in commodity prices, the benefits we have given the people over the past 2 years will be lost. Judging from the situation as a whole, we must adhere to the correct policy of eliminating financial deficits and stabilizing the market and commodity prices. To do this, we must cut back capital construction investments, and at the same time, control the extent of growth in the purchasing power of the people.

The current economic situation is completely different from that in the early 1960's. This is not a case of falling but of steadily rising production. This is not a case of serious difficulty but a relatively marked improvement in the life of the people. Then where is the problem? The problem lies in the inability to cut back accumulated funds according to plan and also in the growth of consumption funds topping the original plan. The accumulated funds of state expenditure and the consumption funds added together have exceeded the total national income. Consequently financial deficits have appeared. The imbalance in financial revenue and expenditure, credit income and expenditure and commodity supply and demand has led to serious difficulty in stabilizing the market and commodity prices under the excellent economic situation. The method we should adopt to overcome this difficulty is to continue to cut back capital construction investments and administrative expenses according to the readjustment plan, strictly control excessive growth in the purchasing power of the people and also adopt other means to eliminate serious waste in economic work and improve economic efficiency. Only by doing so will we be able to eliminate financial deficits and stabilize the market and commodity prices, thus allowing the latent danger to naturally die out by itself.

Some economists and people of the economic circles of the West are puzzled as to why we attached such great importance to financial deficits and the rise in commodity prices. They say that based on the experience of Western countries, as long as the amount of financial deficits, inflation and price increases do not go beyond a certain limit, they can be advantageous to the development of production. A handful of economists in our country also share this view. They do not understand that although China and the countries of the West all have economic difficulties, they are completely different in character. Their difficulties of declining demand (including investment and life) and overproduction are caused by the basic contradiction of the capitalist system.

Slight inflation can stimulate demand, growth and moderate overproduction and prevent economic recession. Our economic difficulty is caused by expanding demand (excessive investment and excessive growth in purchasing power) and the inability of products to satisfy demand. At present, our market supply (including material supply) is already so strained. If commodity prices go up, people will rush to buy up all kinds of things (this happened in the early part of the 1960's) and the market and commodity prices could be thrown into confusion. Under given conditions, inflation may temporarily solve the economic difficulties of the capitalist countries, but it definitely cannot solve the economic difficulties of our country but may instead aggravate our difficulties. This prescription of the Keynesians is no longer effective in the West, so it is even more unsuitable for our country.

3. The Difficulty Can Be Overcome by Conscientiously Carrying Out Readjustment and Reform

The disproportion in our national economy has been a longstanding problem. Before the readjustment policy put forward by the CCP Central Committee, the supply of most means of production and means of subsistence was much more strained than it is now. At the same time, more and more materials were laid up in warehouses and

the national economy had long been bogged down in an inextricable predicament. Since the carrying out of readjustment, because of the retreat on the capital construction front and the priority given to the development of agriculture and light industry, the supply of both the means of production and the means of subsistence has greatly improved over the early part of the 1970's. In the past, it got more strained year by year. Now, it is becoming more relaxed year by year. There has been a marked improvement in the life of the people and particularly the peasants. This is further ironclad proof of the initial success of the readjustment policy. At present, the financial position of the central government is definitely in great difficulty. However, the localities have a bit more money. In particular, many enterprises have their own funds and can to a certain extent make their own arrangements for production, technical innovation and improving the life of the people. Bank savings of urban and rural people have doubled. Is this not a sign that the situation has rarely been as good as it is now since the founding of the People's Republic? It is a good thing for the enterprises and people to have more money, and this definitely is not a bad thing. The problem is that our management work has not caught up.

Localities and enterprises with money have gone in for unrealistic construction. The increase in the income of workers and peasants has exceeded the capacity of the market and commodity supply. This has resulted in people queuing up to buy up quality goods. Judging from the situation as a whole, our economy has started to move. However, judging from the parts, we must adopt effective measures and promptly solve the difficulties appearing in public finance and credit.

The principal measure for overcoming the difficulty is to first strengthen planned management in the field of macroeconomics. The specific content is to further cut back on capital construction investment, and in particular, to put a stop to localities and enterprises carrying out unrealistic construction and the redundant and wasteful phenomenon of the small pushing out the big and the new squeezing out the old. In production, we must also reorganize over 300,000 industrial enterprises and use the method of integration to reduce redundancy and waste. At the same time, we must also strengthen control over improving the life of the people. In the past, Comrade Zhou Enlai and Comrade Chen Yun constantly paid attention to controlling the number of workers. Wages were fixed at that time, and as long as the number of workers was controlled, the total payroll also could not be exceeded. At present, we not only have no control over the number of workers, but we have also lost control over wages as a result of the indiscriminate handing out of bonuses by some of the enterprises. The excessive handing out of bonuses has an impact on the market and commodity prices and compels those enterprises which formerly did not give bonuses to also hand them out. We raised the purchasing price for agricultural products by more than 8 billion yuan in 1979 alone.

There has been very little increase in prices in the 1980 plan, but there has again been a very big increase in excess quota premiums and negotiated purchase prices. Bonuses play an important role in arousing the enthusiasm of the workers. We should not oppose the awarding of bonuses but only the indiscriminate handing out of bonuses. Negotiated prices should also play a good role in increasing the market supply of the three categories of agricultural sideline products, and the abolition of negotiated prices will again rigidly restrain the agricultural

sideline production market which has just become active. However, we must guard against reducing the amount of requisition and arrangement purchases as a result of increasing negotiated prices. In terms of policy, not only must we strengthen management over these two things, but we must also not act rashly. We must not try to solve this complicated problem simply by issuing administrative orders, but must strengthen investigation and study and rely on the strength of the masses to help us carry out supervision and inspection. If we clearly explain the difficulties of the state to the masses, they will help us to overcome them.

Eliminating financial deficits, controlling the issue of currency and stabilizing market and commodity prices are the pressing problems we must give priority to at present. However, this does not mean the end of our readjustment work. We must still basically reform the economic structure and also change the proportionate relations between agriculture, light industry and heavy industry to correspond with the actual conditions that China has a population of 1 billion people, of whom 800 million are peasants, and that the people's standard of living is very low. Our economic work must first insure that the 1 billion people, and particularly the 800 million peasants, will have enough food and clothing and gradually improve their living standard on the basis of developing production. Now, there has been a marked improvement in the standard of living and consumption of most people. They have gradually turned from looking forward to old important things (wristwatches, radios, bicycles and sewing machines) to new important things (television sets, tape recorders, washing machines and electric fans). We must step up the development of agriculture and light industry to satisfy the needs of the people and see to it that every banknote we issue will have a material guarantee. In recent years, there has been a faster development in our agriculture and the development of light industry is also beginning to outstrip the development of heavy industry. At present, there is still a great deal of potential in our agriculture and light industry which has not been brought into play. We must adopt all kinds of effective measures to speed up their development. As for heavy industry, we must in particular strengthen construction in energy, communications and transportation and change their illogical internal proportionate relations. After the shortening of the capital construction front, many enterprises of the machine building industry have not enough work to do. We should direct them to shift from supporting the construction of new plants to supporting the renovation and improvement of old plants and also promote the readjustment, reorganization and transformation of the machine building industry. From the long-term point of view, our readjustment work is not only in balancing financial income and expenditure, but more importantly, also in rationally reorganizing the whole economic structure. Obviously, it is impossible to have healthy development in the national economy if we do not carry out readjustment.

If we look further ahead, we will inevitably come across the reform of the economic management system. At present, many economists have pointed out that our national economy is one of high speed, high accumulation, poor results and low consumption. The ultimate goal of our economic construction is to gradually satisfy the daily increasing needs in the material and cultural life of people throughout the country. If the result of high speed is low consumption, then is there still any meaning to this kind of economic construction? One of the basic reasons giving rise to this abnormal condition is the disproportion in the

national economy mentioned previously. The other is the overcentralized Soviet-style economic system we have adopted.

Financially, what we practice is unified income and spending. Production and circulation all come under the state monopoly for purchase and marketing, or what we call "eating from the same big pot." If we do not set up a responsibility system of accounting at every level but continue "eating from one big pot," we will be unable to eliminate the enormous waste in production, circulation and construction or improve work efficiency. From the long-term point of view, if we do not change this condition, our finance will also be unable to extricate itself from the predicament. In this respect, the ultimate goal of readjustment and reform is still identical and complementary. Those who hold that the reform of the system will hinder economic readjustment and lead to economic difficulty are being shortsighted.

Naturally, although our policy for reforming the system is correct, if it is not properly handled, it can also have a negative effect on readjustment. What we are practicing is financial management by the central and local levels. We have given greater autonomy to the basic-level enterprises and implemented profit sharing so that the localities and enterprises will have some flexible financial resources to arrange their own production and livelihood. In this respect we are absolutely correct. Generally speaking, the localities still have too few flexible financial resources and most of the enterprises still have not enough. However, the state has only so much financial income. The financial income of various levels can only be gradually increased after they have been given greater decisionmaking power. If the localities and enterprises all ask for too much financial power, they are bound to infringe upon the financial income of the central government. If after obtaining flexible financial resources the localities and enterprises do not use them in the direction most urgently needed by the whole country but use them instead for carrying out redundant and wasteful construction resulting in the small squeezing out the big, this will not only be detrimental to readjustment but will also present all kinds of obstacles to readjustment work. In the last 2 years, because we have not properly paid attention or carried out strict control in this direction, the progress of readjustment has been delayed. To correct this tendency, this year we have used such methods as state treasury bonds to temporarily centralize the surplus funds of the localities and enterprises in the central government for unified use in the direction most urgently needed by the state. China is a socialist country, and even though we have financial management by various levels, it is still a system of ownership by the whole people. When necessary, we may adopt the method of compensatory utilization to centralize scattered financial resources in the central government. At the same time, we must also study how to improve the system of financial management by various levels to insure that the financial position of the central government will also succeed in balancing income and expenditure. In short, to ultimately overcome our economic difficulties, we must completely reform the economic management system. This is the key to eliminating waste and improving economic efficiency. From the long-term point of view, this is our strategic policy.

Our difficulties are difficulties that have arisen on the road of progress and we have the means to overcome them, therefore, there is no basis whatsoever for pessimism.

ON MAKING STRENUOUS EFFORTS TO INCREASE THE PRODUCTION OF CONSUMER GOODS

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 pp 8-12

[Article by Song Jiven (1345 1323 2429)]

[Text] The central task on the present economic front is to do a good job in readjusting and stabilizing the economy so as to achieve a balance in revenues and expenditures and to stabilize the prices of commodities. In order to fulfill this task, we must energetically curtail the scale of the capital construction front, readjust the direction of investments, gradually reduce the excessive rate of accumulation and rationally readjust the economic structure. We must cut down on expenses so as to change our financial status, but we must not get bogged down simply on the question of reducing financial expenditures. The fundamental way out is to develop production and open all avenues for financial income. How should we increase financial income? It is of very great significance to bring the production of consumer goods into a strategic position and to energetically increase the production of consumer goods. Summing up historical experiences and starting from the concrete conditions of our country, we must now unswervingly readjust the heavy production structure into a light production structure and make great efforts to increase the production of consumer goods for daily use that are suitable for marketing and for the needs of the consumers, so as to meet the needs for improving the people's livelihood, to accelerate the withdrawal of currency from circulation and to increase financial income. Only in this way can the national economy develop in a planned and proportionate way and can good economic results be attained.

I

The discussion that began in October 1979 and continued and developed in the economic field on the question of the purpose of socialist production was the discussion on what should be the criterion of truth. This discussion has had a positive influence on correcting the "leftist" ideas on the economic front, and we should carry on with the discussion. Practice needs theory, and theory guides practice. Clarifying the question of the final purpose of socialist production from the standpoint of combining theory and practice will be helpful to the readjustment of the economy and will enable our country's socialist economic construction to develop steadily and healthily.

In "The Origin of the Family, Private Ownership and the State," Engels pointed out, "The decisive factor in history is, in the final analysis, production and reproduction in direct livelihood." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 21, p 29) In any society, men must first of all live, and in order to live they must carry out production. Carrying out production is for the purpose of living. The final purpose of producing the means of production is also to produce the means of subsistence needed by the people. The final purpose of socialist production is to meet the daily increasing material and cultural needs of the people. As Comrade Chen Yun said, "The final purpose of carrying out economic construction is to improve the livelihood of the people." It is wrong to carry out production for the purpose of production and to fulfill the plans and quotas blindly.

From the founding of the PRC in 1949 up until 1957, we paid rather close attention to improving the livelihood of the masses, and our economy developed rather smoothly. At that time, the masses' long-term interests were well-coordinated with their immediate interests, i.e., not only satisfying the masses' visible material interests but also opening up vast opportunities for them. People felt that there were good hopes and bright prospects for both the country and the individuals. Therefore, they were very active in their work. Subsequently, the mistakes in economic construction were those of the "leftist" deviation. During the campaign in 1957 against those opposed to rash advancement and during the "Great Leap Forward" in 1958, the "leftist" ideas occupied a dominant position. The influence of the superstructure on the economic base was overstressed, and the subjective initiative was overemphasized. The subjective was divorced from the objective, and economic construction ran counter to the basic law governing the socialist economy and deviated from the final purpose of socialist construction. Proneness to boasting and exaggeration emerged. Communization became the prevailing practice. Instructions were issued blindly. As a result, even feeding the population became a problem and readjustment took 3 years. When the economy was just beginning to change for the better in 1965, the "Great Cultural Revolution" was launched in 1966. The national economy went to the brink of collapse because of the disruption and subversion caused by Lin Biao and the "gang of four." Since the smashing of the "gang of four," recuperation and rehabilitation should have been carried out so as to move forward steadily. But before the holding of the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee, high quotas were still being set in the state plan, thus further extending the capital construction front when it had already been overextended. It was like a man who has just recovered from a serious illness: he cannot even stand firmly, much less run, and if he is forced to run his condition is sure to worsen.

After several economic upheavals, the proportionate relations were seriously dislocated and the economic structure became very irrational. The excessive accumulation rate put a squeeze on the people's consumption. During the period of the first 3-year plan, the accumulation rate was 24.2 percent on average. During the "Great Leap Forward," the accumulation rate developed too fast. From 1958 to 1960, it was over 33 percent per year, and in 1959 it reached 43.8 percent. During the "Great Cultural Revolution," projects were started at will and carried out on an uncontrolled scale. For 7 successive years from 1970 to 1976,

the accumulation rate was between 31 and 34 percent. The scale of construction continued to enlarge in 1977 and 1978 until the accumulation rate reached 32.3 and 36.6 percent respectively. Investments were mainly made in heavy industry. The relations between agriculture, light and heavy industry were so seriously dislocated that a grotesque situation emerged. From 1949 to 1978, the increase in heavy industry was 90.5 times, in light industry 19.7 times and in agriculture 2.4 times. Therefore, for a long period of time, the supply of consumer goods has fallen short of demand. Sometimes the consumer goods are even seriously deficient. We have never conscientiously readjusted the proportionate relations so as to place the production of consumer goods in an important position. Therefore, we must further criticize the "leftist" ideas in order to do a good job in readjusting the economy. Taking the final purpose of developing socialist production as the guiding principle for readjusting the economy, we must handle correctly the proportionate relations and open up a healthy road on which we can do much with a small investment and on which developing production can be closely linked with improving the people's livelihood.

II

The correct handling of the relation between the production of the means of production and the production of the means of subsistence is as important as the correct handling of the relation between accumulation and consumption, and we must pay full attention to it. I have held this viewpoint for many years.

In the development of the national economy, the production of the means of production and the production of the means of subsistence must be developed proportionately. If the development of the means of production is much faster than that of the means of subsistence, the economy will be in a morbid state. This state will be reflected in the market by an insufficient supply of commodities and by price increases. This has been proved by experience at home and abroad. The only criterion for testing truth is practice. Those who go against the laws governing the economy are sure to be punished.

For a long time our accumulation and speed have been high, but our efficiency and consumption have been low. The reason for this has to be studied seriously. In his book "Das Kapital," Marx pointed out: "Some undertakings use up manpower resources and the means of production over a rather long period of time, but they do not provide any effective products within this period of time. However, some production departments not only use up manpower resources and the means of production constantly or several times during a year, but they also provide the means of subsistence and the means of production. On the basis of the production of the society of the public ownership, it must be decided on what scale the former is carried out so as not to be harmful to the latter." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 24, pp 396-397) Please note that Marx was not talking about a capitalist society but a society of public ownership. The two large categories are dependent on each other and are restricted by each other in their enlarged reproduction. The first category supplies the second category with additional means of production and determines the scale of enlarged reproduction of the second category, while the second category provides the first category with additional means of subsistence and restricts the scale

of enlarged reproduction of the first category. Only by maintaining a rational proportionate relation between the two large categories can social production be constantly developed. There have been too many heavy industrial projects involving large investments and long construction periods owing to our lack of understanding of this point. There have not been sufficient funds in the first place, and the use of the funds has never been rational. We did not do what was profitable, but did what was unprofitable even though we incurred debts. As a result, the gap between the demand for and the production of consumer goods was further widened.

China's economic construction has for a long time been oriented toward a heavy production structure. Emphasis has been put on giving priority to the development of the means of production, while production of the means of subsistence has been undervalued. Thus the proportion between the two large categories has been seriously out of balance, and the production of the means of production has mainly been for the production of the means of production itself. Little attention has been paid to supporting the production of the means of subsistence. China's yearly steel output in 1980 was over 27 million tons, but the yearly demands of 1.55 million tons of steel for light industrial production could not be met and 411,000 tons had to be imported. Liaoning Province has the largest iron and steel complex in China--the Angang Steel Works. The yearly steel output of the province is more than 5 million tons. Light industrial production of the province requires 170,000 tons of steel, which accounts for only 3 percent of the steel output. However, the variety and quality of the steel produced in this province cannot meet the needs of light industry, and one-third has to be imported or brought in from other provinces. Practice has proved that this is a wrong road which we must not continue to take.

China is a highly populated country which is not financially solid and which has a rather poor economic foundation. Its construction funds are not sufficient. Its level of science and technology is not high. Its management level lags behind. The problem of feeding 1 billion people must be solved, and their livelihood must also be gradually improved. In accordance with the concrete conditions of our country, the predominantly heavy structure must be readjusted to a predominantly light one. The light structure that I am proposing should be implemented as follows: First, conscientiously implement the principle of developing the national economy in a planned and proportionate way. Under the guiding principle of developing agriculture, light and heavy industry proportionately, more effort should be devoted to developing the production of the two large categories of agriculture and light industry. Second, not only must the developmental speed of heavy industry be reduced but its internal structure must be readjusted. The production by heavy industry for its own purposes must be transformed into production in support of agriculture and light industry. Third, the supply of the means of subsistence must in the main conform to the increase of the social purchasing power and to the demands for improving the people's livelihood. These three conditions are related to each other, and the developmental scale of agriculture and light industry has to be considered in relation to them.

There are many advantages to building a light structure in which more effort can be devoted to the development of agriculture and light industry. First, light industrial products occupy an important position in the domestic market. In 1979, the total volume of social retail sales of products belonging to the light industrial department system was 51.18 billion yuan, which accounted for 35.8 percent of the total volume of retail sales of consumer goods throughout the country. Second, development of light industry will require a large work force. For every 1 million yuan of fixed assets in light industry, 257 people can be allocated, while in heavy industry, only 94 people can be allocated. Third, there will be less energy consumption. For every 10,000 yuan of output value in light industry, 1,780 units of electricity and 3.5 tons of coal are consumed, while in heavy industry, 5,500 units of electricity and 17 tons of coal are consumed--2 to 4 times as much. Fourth, construction periods are shorter and faster results can be attained. Capital outlay in light industry might be recouped within 1 year 10 months on average, but it will take 5 years 7 months to recoup capital outlay in heavy industry. Fifth, with less investment, there is more accumulation. Within the 27 years from 1952 to 1978, the state's investment in light industry was not large relatively speaking, but the amount of taxes and profits turned over to the state by light industry was not small. The ratio between investments and taxes and profits was 1:13. The state's investments in heavy industry were not small relatively speaking, but the taxes and profits turned over to the state by heavy industry were not as much as had been desired. The ratio between investments and taxes and profits was 1:1.7. If the state had been able to invest more in light industry over the past 20 years, there would have been a large increase of commodities and taxes and profits, an increase in financial income, a withdrawal of money from circulation and an improvement in the supply of commodities on the market. What is more important is that there would have been positive effects on the healthy development of the whole national economy. The net value of the fixed assets now possessed by the enterprises belonging to the light industrial department system is 21 billion yuan. The taxes and profits realized in 1980 were also 21 billion yuan. This means that the fixed assets of one enterprise belonging to the light industrial department system can be recouped within a year. In addition, remittance exchange in light industry is rather high. One hundred yuan of light industrial output value provide export remittance exchange worth \$1.80, while 100 yuan of heavy industrial output value only provides \$0.70. It is obvious that a light structure is beneficial to overcoming short supply on the market, financial difficulties, shortage of foreign remittance and unemployment problems and to changing the passive economic situation. It is also beneficial to laying an excellent foundation for large-scale economic development in the future. Therefore, from now on it is necessary to conscientiously consider the readjustment of the heavy structure into a light one, so as to do a good job in readjusting the economy.

III

Building a light structure so as to develop agriculture, light and heavy industry proportionately will be a great change. The heavy structure, which was built over a period of 20 to 30 years, cannot be changed in a day. In order to realize this change, the "leftist" influence must first of all be eradicated

from our minds. According to our recent contacts with some comrades, we can see that because of the long influence of "leftist" tendencies, some comrades have seemingly agreed to build a light structure and to devote more efforts to the development of agriculture and light industry, but in reality they do not completely agree. They either regard it as a simple problem or as an expedient measure for overcoming difficulties. If ideological obstacles are not removed, readjustment of the production structure cannot be smoothly carried out. Attention must be paid to the following arguments:

"The growth of light industry has surpassed that of heavy industry, so the readjustment is sufficient." For more than 20 years, the growth of China's heavy industry surpassed that of light industry every year. Only in these past 2 years has the situation been reversed. The growth of light industry has surpassed that of heavy industry, and so some comrades have made this unrealistic appraisal. Basing themselves on this appraisal, they think that there is no need to readjust the production structure. In 1979, light industrial production rose by 9.6 percent and heavy industrial production by 7.7 percent. In 1980, light industrial production rose by 17.4 percent and heavy industrial production by 1.6 percent. Of course this good development must be affirmed. But they have only seen one side of the problem and have ignored the other side. Because light industry has been stringently squeezed out for many years, much is still needed for the people's livelihood. Although the growth of light industry has surpassed that of heavy industry, it still does not accord with the social purchasing power or with the demands of the people's livelihood. In 1979, the social purchasing power increased by 32 billion yuan. The rate of increase was 20 percent. But the volume of supply of social commodities only increased by 15 percent. In 1980, the social purchasing power increased by 30 billion yuan over the 1979 figure. The rate of increase was 18.7 percent. But the volume of supply of social commodities only increased by 13.3 percent. The growth of the social purchasing power once again surpassed that of the volume of supply of social commodities. Because the policy is correct, agricultural production has developed rapidly and the peasants' income has increased. There is such a great demand among the 800 million peasants for light industrial products that it is far from being satisfied. It is obvious that the development of light industry is not good enough, but, what is more, it is far from being good. The readjustment of the production structure can only be said to have just been carried out; it is far from being completed.

"Light industrial production can be carried out in the same manner as a hammer-smith carries out his trade. It does not need any investment. It will be enough just to have some loans." This viewpoint is not beneficial to carrying out readjustment. It is true that less money is needed for light industrial production compared to heavy industrial production, but it will not do to handle light industrial production in a slipshod manner and without sufficient construction funds. In the past, when heavy industry was squeezing out light industry, there was a serious shortage of funds for light industry, and light industrial production barely increased after great efforts to collect funds had been made. As a result, many factories incurred a large amount of debts. Some could hardly maintain their simple reproduction process. Take Shanghai as an example. There are in Shanghai many famous brands of light industrial products which enjoy good

sales at home and abroad. But in recent years, in order to muster possibilities for increasing production, many canteens, changing rooms, kindergartens and lavatories of factories have been removed. Nevertheless, workshops are still crowded. In 1965, workshops were required to have 1,510 square meters for the production of 10,000 bicycles. But by 1979, this area had been reduced to 666 square meters. We cannot become further indebted when old debts have not been paid. Moreover, there is a world of difference between the present-day light industrial production and that of the postliberation period. Now we have a high level of mechanization, and we have adopted new technology in many aspects. The structure of products has also changed, and more investments are required. An example is the paper-manufacturing industry. So far as its nature of production is concerned, it belongs to the heavy chemical industry. Some foreigners regard paper as "soft steel plate." To increase capacity by 1 million tons, including that which has been restructured and taken out of some old factories, an investment of 2.5 billion yuan is required. Watchmaking and the bicycle- and sewing machine-manufacturing trades cannot be undertaken in the same way as a hammer-smith carries out his trade, because the processing skills and mechanical structure are rather complicated. Building a synthetic detergent factory requires twice as much investment as building a soap factory of the same scale. More investments are required by some trades for rational use and distribution of resources. For instance, developing well salt and lake salt undertakings in the interior regions of China requires 3 times as much investment as does building sea salt fields of the same scale. Building a sugarbeet sugar factory in the north requires one-third more investment than building a sugarcane sugar factory of the same scale in the south. In addition, heavy industrial production is mainly carried out for its own purposes, so light industry is forced to struggle by itself. The materials industry requires more and more investment. In the first 5-year plan, there was no materials industry in light industry. In the second 5-year plan, investments in materials industry of the light industrial system only accounted for 0.7 percent of the investments in the state budget. Subsequently, investments constantly increased, and they accounted for 26.7 percent 3 years before the fifth 5-year plan. We should also realize that there has been a great change in the people's demand for light industrial products. Their demand for medium- and high-grade products and durable consumer goods has increased. It is true that old factories can still be used for developing the production of medium- and high-grade products and durable consumer goods. But without the necessary funds for technical innovation, it will be impossible to carry out large-scale production of good, cheap products. In allocating financial and material resources, the needs of light industry have to be considered. Some of the idle workshops of heavy industrial enterprises which have closed down or which do not have enough production tasks should be allotted to light industry. In short, taking the developments of light industry as a very simple matter and being unwilling to support it wholeheartedly means that the idea of underestimating light industry is still making mischief in our minds.

"We should set up a mixed type of structure." In recent years, in the summing up of the experience on the economic construction during the 30 years since the founding of the PRC and in the tentative study of economic readjustment and restructuring, more and more people have felt that the heavy structure is not in conformity with the concrete conditions of our country, and the demand for

building a light structure has been growing. Under such circumstances, some people have suggested a mixed type of structure. It is worth studying. What is a mixed type of structure? The implication of this is not very clear. It seems that their suggestion is to build a structure that is neither light nor heavy. If their suggestion is to develop agriculture, light and heavy industry proportionately, then I agree with them. But the problem is that the development of agriculture, light and heavy industry will not be proportionate in the future even if the structure is neither light nor heavy. It is because of the adoption of the heavy structure for so many years that the present development of agriculture, light and heavy industry is disproportionate. If we are not willing to abandon the heavy structure, and if it is not clear that we must emphasize the development of agriculture and light industry and that we must make heavy industry support agriculture and light industry, we will not be able to develop agriculture, light and heavy industry proportionately. Under no circumstances should a "mixed type of structure," the meaning of which is not very clear, be used as a subterfuge to allow the heavy structure to continue to exist.

"The people's livelihood will not improve if basic industries fail to move forward." In the development of the national economy, the production of the means of production and that of the means of subsistence must develop proportionately. The development of industries, especially coal, electricity, oil and transportation, must increase. Otherwise, the four modernizations cannot be realized. When we work out our long-term plans, we must soberly understand this question. Otherwise, we are sure to make serious mistakes. As to the relationship between basic industries and the improvement of the people's livelihood, we must not only look at the development of basic industries but also know the direction in which they are going. In the past, under the ideological guidance of giving priority to the development of heavy industry and of "taking steel as the key link," financial resources, material resources and manpower were concentrated on protecting heavy industry. When funds were short, those allocated for light industry were slashed. When coal and electricity were deficient, their supplies to light industry were stopped. When transport capacity was not sufficient, light industry had to give way. Practice has proved that if things are done in this way, the people's livelihood will never improve, no matter how much effort is devoted to the development of basic industries. In 1980, however, more attention was paid to the production of consumer goods. In that year, the production of energy dropped by 2.9 percent, while the production of light industry rose by 17.4 percent. The supply of everyday consumer goods was increased. It is obvious that we cannot say in a sweeping way that if basic industries fail to move forward, the people's livelihood will not improve. As long as we pay attention to the production of consumer goods, and as long as we make appropriate allocations so as to increase light industrial production, the people's livelihood will gradually improve, even if basic industries are maintained at the present level.

Increasing the production of consumer goods is a top priority task. We should quicken our steps of readjustment in the direction of a light production structure. Of course, readjustment work is quite complicated. We should constantly sum up experience so that the national economy can develop healthily and steadily.

A LOOK AT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACCUMULATION AND CONSUMPTION

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 pp 13-20

[Article by Yang Bo [2799 3134]]

[Text] The purpose of probing into proportionate relations between accumulation and consumption is to define a proper proportion between accumulation funds and consumption funds within national revenue. The national revenue refers to the new revenue created in a certain period (for example, 1 year) by workers in various material production departments such as agriculture, industry, building construction industry, transportation and communications, and commerce. It is newly created material wealth as well as newly created value (usually called net production value). The distribution of the national revenue in accumulation and consumption is directly related to state construction and people's life. In order to change the backwardness of our economy and carry out the construction of the four modernizations, it is necessary to allocate a certain amount from the national revenue for accumulation every year. But the amount must not be excessive, nor is it permitted to increase accumulation by increasing or even decreasing consumption, because by doing so the enthusiasm of the broad masses of people for building socialism will be dampened. Therefore, in studying and handling the national revenue it is of vital importance to handle well the relationship between accumulation and consumption, combine people's intermediate interests and long-term interests with individual and collective interests, and make overall plans by taking all factors into consideration so that we will be able to increase production, develop the construction of the four modernizations constantly and stably, and constantly improve people's living standard.

In distributing and using the national revenue over the past 3 decades, how did we handle the relation between accumulation and consumption? Was there any problem, experience or lesson?

During the first 5-year plan, the proportion of accumulation in the national revenue was on average 24.2 percent each year, with 23.1 percent in 1953 and 24.9 percent in 1957. During these 5 years, the percentage generally increased and the yearly fluctuation was very small. But big changes have taken place since 1958. During the second 5-year plan, the yearly accumulation rate on average increased to 30.8 percent, with a big yearly fluctuation. For example, the accumulation rate in 1958 suddenly increased to 33.9 percent from 24.9 percent in 1957 and it further increased to 43.8 percent in 1959. It was

maintained at a level of 39.6 percent in 1960. In 1961, it dropped to 19.2 percent and took a further slide to 10.4 percent in 1962. The whole national economy took a turn for the better in 1963 after readjustment measures were taken, with the accumulation rate increasing to 17.5 percent; in 1964 and 1965 it increased to 22.2 percent and 27.1 percent respectively, an average of 22.7 percent for the 2 years lower than in 1953. In the first year of the third 5-year plan, i.e., 1966, the accumulation rate again rose to 30.6 percent. In 1967-1969, "production was suspended in order to make revolution" everywhere and this resulted in a drop in production throughout the country and a much lower accumulation rate than in 1966. The accumulation rate was slightly higher than 21 percent in 1967 and 1968, and it increased to 23.2 percent in 1969. In 1970, industrial and agricultural production began to increase again and the accumulation rate soared to 32.9 percent. From 1970 up to 1976, it was maintained at over 30 percent. Following the downfall of the "gang of four" and particularly after the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee, the entire national economy has been rapidly rehabilitated and developed, under the correct leadership of the party Central Committee, thanks to the efforts of the whole country. The national revenue in 1977 was 8.3 percent higher than in 1976, in 1978 it was 12.3 percent higher than in 1977, and in 1979 it was 6.9 percent higher than in 1978. But the accumulation rate in the distribution and use of the national revenue was still too high, an average of over 30 percent. In 1978 it was as high as 36.5 percent, in 1979 it dropped to 33.6 percent and in 1980 it is expected to be no less than 30 percent.

It can be seen from the above figures that the relation between accumulation and consumption in the distribution and use of the national revenue has changed tremendously in the past 2 decades and more since 1958. This shows that the increase in the accumulation rate has been too high and too fast and with too big a yearly fluctuation. It is apparent that the relation between accumulation and consumption has been seriously out of balance. In addition, the main relations within accumulation funds and within consumption funds are also unbalanced. For example, in accumulation funds, production accumulation increased too fast in too big a proportion while nonproduction accumulation increased too slowly in too little proportion; that is to say, the "meat" has been squeezed out by the "bones." The ratio between production accumulation and nonproduction accumulation during the first 5-year plan was 59.8:40.2. It changed to 77.5:22.5 during the fourth 5-year plan; in 1957 it was 60.1:39.9 and in 1978 it was 82.9:17.1. Following the readjustment work over the past 2 years, the ratio between production and nonproduction accumulations was changed to 65.5:34.5 in 1979. The accumulation for fixed assets has also been out of proportion with the accumulation for floating assets within accumulation funds; social consumption funds increased rapidly to surpass the growth of consumption funds of individuals of the urban and rural population. The proportion of social consumption increased from 7.6 percent in 1957 to 12.2 percent in 1979, and this situation was also abnormal.

Why is it that, despite the apparent imbalance in the proportion between accumulation and consumption and between the major relations within accumulation and within consumption, we were not able to correct this for a long period? In my opinion there were mainly two reasons:

First, it was because of the longstanding "leftist" errors in the guiding ideology of our economic work, which was divorced from reality. The work was also characterized by being overanxious for quick results, disobeying objective laws, exaggerating the subjective role, and indiscriminately setting high speed, high goals and high accumulation in developing the economy. In addition, there was a demand in 1958 to double steel output, while for agriculture there was the slogan "The land will produce as much as required by those who are bold enough." These were just a few typical examples. The political report that was approved by the 8th party congress in September 1956 pointed out, after summing up the experiences in the first 4 years of the first 5-year plan, that: "The improvement of state construction must be properly combined with the improvement of the people's life, that is to say, the proportion between accumulation and consumption in the national revenue must be handled well.... If the proportion for accumulation in the national revenue is too high and proper consideration is not given to improving the people's living standard on the basis of increasing labor productivity and to taking into account people's intermediate interests and individual interests, people's enthusiasm for building socialism will be dampened and socialist interests will be spoiled." ("Document of the 8th National Congress of the CCP," People's Publishing House 1957 edition, p 814) But this correct resolution was not completely implemented. The second 5-year plan was started with the slogan "Great leap forward," which was followed by impractical slogans and goals such as that everything must be "undertaken in a big way." An increasing number of new projects was started. The total investment in national capital construction was doubled from that of the previous year. The accumulation rate in the national revenue jumped from 24.9 percent in 1957 to 33.9 percent in 1958, and it soared to 43.8 percent in 1959. The total national revenue began to drop in 1960, but the accumulation rate was maintained at 39.6 percent. On the other hand, not only did the proportion of consumption funds in the national revenue drop by a big margin, but the actual per-capita consumption throughout the country also dropped. Thus with the continuous great leap forward, high accumulation, "blind instructions" and serious natural calamities, coupled with perfidious acts by the Khrushchev clique, industrial and agricultural production rapidly dropped. Agricultural output throughout the country dropped for 3 successive years, beginning in 1959, to the level prior to 1957. Industrial output also dropped drastically in 1961 and 1962, and the entire national economy was in a very difficult situation. The party Central Committee summed up experiences and lessons, and in 1961 it proposed the eight-character policy of readjusting, consolidating, replenishing and improving the national economy. Thanks to arduous and meticulous work by the whole party and the whole people, who were united as one, industrial and agricultural production began to rapidly develop again in 1963 and the work in various sectors returned to normal. In 1965, the various tasks that were proposed in the eight-character policy were mainly completed. The national economy took a turn for the better in an all-round way and the proportionate relations in various aspects, including that between accumulation and consumption, were relatively harmonious. The situation of the national economy throughout the country was still very good in the first half of 1966, with industrial and agricultural output continuing to increase. But in the second half of that year, the "Great Cultural Revolution" was launched throughout the country, and it aggravated the mistakes caused by the "leftist" ideology in previous years and led to a serious imbalance in the entire national economy, throwing it into confusion for a long period.

Second, it was because of the interference and sabotage activities by the Lin Biao and Jiang Qing counterrevolutionary cliques. Soon after the "Great Cultural Revolution" began, they threw into confusion social order, work order and production order. They incited people to "stop production and make revolution" and to engage in "beating, smashing and looting." As a result, the national economy, which had just been rehabilitated and redeveloped over the past previous years, rapidly weakened again. Compared with that in 1966, industrial and agricultural production throughout the country was 9.6 percent lower in 1967, while in 1968 it was 4.2 percent lower than in 1967. Gross industrial output value decreased by 13.8 percent and 5 percent respectively in 1967 and 1968. Owing to the efforts made by the broad masses of cadres and people in resisting and struggling against the counterrevolutionary sabotage activities of the Lin Biao and Jiang Qing cliques, the industrial and agricultural production and construction throughout the country have been increasing to some extent since 1969, with the exception of a few particular years. In short, the 10 years of turbulence brought serious calamities to the Chinese people, because during this period both the state production and construction and the people's life were seriously damaged. Had there been no "Great Cultural Revolution" and interference and sabotage by the Lin Biao and Jiang Qing counterrevolutionary cliques, the situations in our economy, technology and people's living standard would not be what they are today. During the 10 turbulent years, it was impossible to guide economic and planning work because it was out of control. In addition, the organizations and reference materials needed for planning were damaged. In some years it was even impossible to formulate a national plan or even to hold a meeting on national planning. There was planning in some years but it could not be implemented. The "theory of the productive forces," "production oppressing revolution" and "material incentives" were subject to criticism for years on end. The socialist principles of material interests and of distribution according to work were regarded as bourgeois and revisionist and were criticized. It was utterly impossible to correctly handle the relations between accumulation and consumption. We all still remember that when Comrade Deng Xiaoping was responsible for the daily routine of the party Central Committee in 1975, he explicitly stipulated wage increases in the same year and the increased amount was included in the expenditure of the state budget. But in the last quarter of that year, when various regions and departments were ready to readjust wages, the decision could not be materialized because the "gang of four" frantically pounced on the people. How, in such a situation, could proportionate relations in the national economy be planned in an orderly way by taking all factors into consideration and be developed harmoniously?

Following the downfall of the "gang of four" and particularly since the holding of the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee, the national economy has been rapidly rehabilitated and developed owing to a series of measures taken by the party Central Committee. At the same time, efforts have been made to improve the people's material and cultural living standard on the basis of developing production. Compared with 1976, the average per-capita consumption of the entire nation in 1979 increased by 40 yuan. If deductions are made for the fluctuation in prices, this figure represented a 15 percent increase, with an average annual increase of 4.8 percent. In 1980, average per-capita consumption increased by over 4 percent. This is the first time such

a situation has appeared for 2 decades. No doubt, because of the fact that production had been hampered for many years and the proportion between accumulation and consumption in the distribution and use of the national revenue had not been handled well for a long time, thus seriously affecting the people's life, the present living standard both in urban and rural areas is still very low. Therefore, it is necessary for us, on the basis of developing production and labor productivity, to constantly readjust the proportionate relation between accumulation and consumption, properly lower accumulation, and conscientiously and gradually improve the people's standard of living. It cannot be denied that during the 2 years following the downfall of the "gang of four," we underestimated the serious effects on the national economy caused by the interference and sabotage activities carried out by the Lin Biao and Jiang Qing cliques. The "leftist" thinking, which existed in economic work for a long period, had yet to be overcome while the overall scale of economic construction was still excessive. In 1978 in particular, when industrial and agricultural production was developing quite rapidly, financial revenue was set too high. Consequently, besides what was originally planned for the year, there was an addition of several billion yuan for investment in capital construction. As a result, the accumulation rate in 1978 rose to 36.5 percent from 32.3 percent in 1977. This situation drew the attention of the party Central Committee, which consequently put forth the eight-character policy of readjusting, reforming, rectifying and improving after the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee. But, because a number of cadres did not really understand the necessity and importance of readjustment or because their view toward it was not unanimous, they have not been able to thoroughly implement the readjustment work. As a result, the scale of capital construction is still excessive, the accumulation rate is still relatively high and the situation of imbalance in the national economy has not been basically changed. To solve this problem, the party Central Committee and the State Council recently decided to further readjust the national economy. We believe that, following this readjustment, our national economy will develop normally and healthily.

We have rich experience and lessons in developing our national economy over the past 31 years. We must meet the demands of the party Central Committee, conscientiously sum up experience, promote our achievements and overcome the mistakes caused by the "leftist" ideology in our work, so that we can do our work even better and develop the construction of the four modernizations according to our specific conditions and on a sound basis.

How can we handle well the relation between accumulation and consumption? According to the past negative and positive experiences, I think it is necessary for us to solve the following problems.

1. Follow Objective Economic Laws and Resolutely Implement the Principle of Gradually Improving the People's Living Standard on the Basis of Developing Production

The aim of socialist production is to satisfy the ever-increasing material and cultural needs of the members of society. In the future, when annual planning, medium-term planning and long-term planning are being worked out, it is

imperative to correct the "leftist" ideology, proceed from reality, seek truth from facts, follow objective laws and work according to our capability. Basing ourselves on necessity and possibility, we must first of all plan well the growth rate of industrial and agricultural production and the growth rate of the national revenue for a planned period, and on this basis we must fix the minimum amount for consumption in the distribution and use of the national revenue. This minimum means that the average per-capita consumption (including increases in population) must not be lower than the actual level of the previous planning. On this basis, we must fix the rate in the improvement of people's life within the planned period according to the situation in the development of production, the growth of labor productivity and increases in the national revenue and by following the party's principle of gradually improving the people's standard of living. The amount for accumulation is decided by the amount of surplus in the national revenue. That is to say, priority must be given to improving the people's life and the amount for accumulation is secondary. In this way, we will be able to insure a proportionate balance and consequently improve the people's material and cultural life on the basis of developing production.

After work has been done to basically fix the proportion between accumulation funds and consumption funds in the national revenue, we must proceed to consider if the production of the means of production and the means of subsistence is arranged in harmony with this proportion. If the production plan for the two categories of products does not accord with accumulation and consumption funds, then it is necessary to readjust the speed and proportion of the production and readjust the proportionate relation between accumulation and consumption and to study the necessary compensation from foreign trade. In this way, both accumulation and consumption funds will be materially guaranteed.

Within accumulation funds, the proportion for nonproductive accumulation directly related to improvement of the people's life must be properly increased for a certain period in the future. For example, it is necessary to increase investments in housing, science, culture, education and health. Within consumption funds, it is necessary to increase the proportion that is directly related to the urban and rural population and decrease social consumption, particularly by cutting down on administrative expenditures in state organizations, the army, enterprises and other undertakings and reducing group purchasing power.

2. Handle Well the Distribution Between Accumulation and Consumption by Starting From Developing Production

The Marxist theory of reproduction tells us that distribution is determined by production. That is to say, the amount of accumulation funds and the extent to which the people's living standard can be improved are determined by the speed in the development of production and by the proportion and growth rate of the means of production and the means of subsistence in the total social product (the factor of foreign trade is excluded). As we all know, from the viewpoint of value, the national revenue is a new value created by the laborers of various material production departments, and this value is shown in the form of materials by newly added means of production and means of subsistence; the redistribution of the distribution of the national revenue, i.e., the process of the movement

of value, is also the process of the movement of materials in this redistribution, but it is used in accumulation or consumption and it is expressed through certain material products. We must consider social needs and the need to improve the people's living standard, adopt various correct policies and measures that are advantageous to developing production, and strive to develop industrial and agricultural production so that we will be able to constantly add varieties of products and develop their quality. Only when social production has developed and the national revenue has increased will we be able to harmonize the production of the two categories of the means of production and the means of subsistence and increase accumulation funds and consumption funds with a material guarantee. Otherwise, even if we reduce the accumulation rate and increase the proportion for consumption funds, the people's life still cannot be improved. For example, the accumulation rate in the distribution of the national revenue in 1961 was reduced to 19.2 percent and again cut to 10.4 percent in 1962; the proportion for consumption funds was respectively increased to 80.8 percent and 89.6 percent from 60.4 percent in 1960. Yet the result was that the people's living standard was lower than in the previous years. This was because, during those 2 years, both industrial and agricultural production and the national revenue decreased. Following the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee, the party Central Committee implemented the eight-character policy of readjusting, reforming, rectifying and improving the national economy. Thus, proceeding from actively developing production, we began the readjustment work by developing agriculture and light industry (of course, the proportion between accumulation and consumption was also readjusted). Owing to a series of policies and measures over the past 2 years, our agriculture and light industry have developed quite rapidly, while the proportionate relations among agriculture, light industry and heavy industry have been improved considerably. Compared with 1978, in 1979 gross agricultural output value increased by 8.6 percent, and gross industrial output value increased by 8.5 percent, of which the gross output value of light industry increased by 9.6 percent, topping the 7.7 percent growth in the gross output value of heavy industry. In 1980, gross industrial output value increased by 8.4 percent, of which the gross output value of light industry increased by 17.4 percent, much higher than that of heavy industry. These are the highest percentages for many years. It is precisely because of this achievement that we have had the necessary material guarantee for readjusting the proportionate relation in the distribution of accumulation and consumption and for improving the people's living standard over the past 2 years.

It is wrong to talk about distribution in isolation from production, but we cannot, because of this, neglect the counteraction of distribution on production. Facts have proved that, when the proportion between accumulation and consumption in the national revenue is handled well, social reproduction will be able to develop and the production of the two categories of the means of production and the means of subsistence will be in harmony; otherwise, the development of production will be affected and the production of the means of production will be out of proportion with the production of the means of subsistence. During a certain period in the past, we did not arrange well the distribution between accumulation and consumption, or the distribution of accumulation funds among various departments, and this resulted in imbalance between industry and agriculture, light industry and heavy industry, between the "bones" and the "meat"

and between economic construction and cultural and educational construction. This shows that it is very important to pay attention to distribution, and we cannot neglect the counteraction of distribution on production. In studying the distribution of accumulation and consumption, we must explore how, through rational distribution, to develop social productivity rapidly and healthily and how to constantly improve the people's material and cultural life on the basis of developing production.

3. Proceed From Reality in Our Country and Fix a Rational Proportion Between Accumulation and Consumption for Every Period

Ours is a vast country with a huge population but a weak foundation. In order to fulfill the great historical task of realizing the four modernizations, it is necessary for the state and the collective to maintain a certain amount of accumulation. Without accumulation it is impossible to build new and modern enterprises, transform the great number of old enterprises, gradually modernize agriculture and constantly expand social reproduction. But, owing to our huge population and weak foundation, accumulation must not be excessive and the accumulation rate must not be too high. Our country has a population of 1 billion, of which 800 million are peasants. With an annual population increase of 10 million or more people, the accumulation funds for the newly increased population alone comes to 2 to 3 billion yuan. We cannot increase accumulation at the expense of not increasing or even decreasing consumption. On the other hand, the people's living standard can only be gradually improved on the basis of developing production and increasing labor productivity. We cannot increase consumption at the expense of cutting accumulation. In readjusting the national economy over the past few years, it was necessary and correct to properly decrease accumulation and increase consumption because of too high an accumulation rate in the previous years. But we cannot do so forever. Consequently, it is imperative for us to conscientiously sum up experience and policies, proceed from reality, and study and fix a rational and relatively stable proportionate relation between accumulation and consumption for a certain planned period (e.g., 5 years).

Some comrades have proposed that the accumulation rate in the distribution of our national revenue can be properly kept at 25 percent, and this proposal is based on the situation in the implementation of the first 5-year plan and on reference materials concerning other countries. In my opinion, this proposal merits discussion. As a socialist country, our country is engaged in a planned economy and it is completely necessary to fix a relatively rational accumulation rate for any planned period after a comprehensive study of every aspect has been made. But we cannot regard an accumulation rate as stagnant. The accumulation rate in the first 5-year plan was a statistic of that period and can only be used as a reference in our study. If we were to consider it the most rational accumulation rate, we would not have enough theory and figures to back up our view. As we all know, all things are constantly changing in the movement of contradictions and so is the situation in various proportionate relations in our national economy, including the proportionate relation between accumulation and consumption. As production is constantly developing, the economic structure is constantly being readjusted and social demand is constantly changing. The proportion in the distribution of accumulation and consumption will also constantly change. The

proportion for each planned period can only be fixed on the basis of the growth of production, the growth of national revenue, the principle of gradually improving the people's living standard, and the balances in the situation of accumulation funds and consumption funds and of the means of production and the means of subsistence. It has been mentioned above that an arrangement for accumulation and consumption is relatively rational when it results in increases and not decreases in the per-capita consumption level during a planned period. In line with our reality and owing to our heavy tasks in carrying out the construction of the four modernizations and the need to gradually improve the people's living standard, I think it is more proper to keep the accumulation rate during the sixth 5-year plan at 25 to 30 percent on the basis of present calculations and the price system. My reasons are:

First, our present economic situation, production structure, price levels and construction scale drastically differ from those in the first 5-year plan period. The accumulation rate at that time can only be used as a reference in studying the future proportionate relation for accumulation and consumption in the distribution of the national revenue; it can under no circumstances be regarded as the only criterion. Some comrades have said that during the first 5-year plan, our national economy was able to develop smoothly and the proportionate relations in various aspects were in harmony mainly because the accumulation rate was kept at 23 to 25 percent. But the fact is that the first 5-year plan, which was approved by the 2d Plenary Session of the 1st NPC in July 1955, did not mention the proportionate relation between accumulation and consumption, much less keeping the accumulation rate at a certain percentage. It was only in 1956, when the State Statistics Bureau issued figures on the national production and revenue and the proportionate relation in the distribution for accumulation and consumption and in 1956, when there appeared a premature arrangement in the national economy, that various departments concerned and some theorists began to pay attention to the accumulation rate. This was the situation at that time.

Second, we cannot say whether our accumulation rate is proper just by relying on reference materials issued by other countries. This is because not only is the development of the economy, price system and policies different in each country and therefore cannot be simply compared, but also because there are big differences in national production and revenue, range and method of calculation in distribution, and the prices of the means of production and the means of subsistence between Western capitalist countries and our country. It is necessary for us to analyze the figures for other countries and ours before we directly compare them. Our range and method of calculation is basically the same as that of the Soviet Union, and therefore a comparison can be made with it. But our price structure is different while the accumulation rate in the national revenue published by the Soviet Union is not true. The 25 percent accumulation rate that appeared in textbooks on political economics and in other places is lower than the actual accumulation rate. Of course, that does not mean that it is not good for us to study the materials of other countries. What I mean is that, in comparing the materials of other countries with ours, it is necessary to differentiate between the range, method of calculation and prices of other countries and ours. Only in this way will the materials from other countries have a reference value for us.

Third, the readjustment of the proportionate relation between accumulation and consumption is an involved process because this work is related to a great number of large- and medium-scale capital construction projects now being undertaken, to the production structure of the two big categories of products that have been formed over the past years and to national economic readjustment. On the other hand, we must understand that accumulation stands in contradiction to consumption but that both are basically identical. We must remember that in the past we did not pay much attention to improving the people's standard of living; nevertheless, it can only be improved gradually on the basis of developing production and increasing labor productivity. It is impractical to complete this work in a few years. We can only improve the people's living standard according to reality and our own capability. It is wrong to expand capital construction by issuing more and more money. In improving the people's living standard we must do more and speak less. Anything that can be done to this end must be done; anything that can be done but not at the moment must be clearly explained to the masses. Such an attitude toward the people is serious, responsible and in line with seeking truth from facts. In short, in improving the people's standard of living, we must meet the demands of the party Central Committee. We must time and again explain to cadres and people that our country is still poor and that, with the duty of realizing the four modernizations, we must continue to work tirelessly and with an innovative spirit.

4. Strictly Control the Scale of Capital Construction, Rationally Use Floating Funds and Improve Economic Results

In order to constantly expand reproduction it is necessary to add new production capability, build some production enterprises and undertake new projects, and transform and expand some old enterprises. For a long time in the past our work was influenced by the "leftist" ideology and in such a situation we paid more attention to need rather than possibility. We did not follow the principle of proceeding from our reality and capability, nor did we do a good job in comprehensively balancing the entire national economy. During a conference on planning, various departments and regions often contended for investment and projects (this situation was largely related to an irrational economic management system, too rigid control by state planning, and unified financial revenue and expenditure). As a result, the already excessive scale of capital construction was further expanded through "bargaining." This resulted in excessive investments in capital construction and in accumulation squeezing out consumption. It is imperative in the future to follow the principle of working according to our capability, strictly control the size of capital construction, resolutely shorten the capital construction front, and handle well the relations between accumulation and consumption.

It must be pointed out that in the past when we talked about developing production as fast as possible, we would first of all think about investment in capital construction and new projects. On the other hand, we did not pay enough attention to other aspects, such as how to improve returns on investment and shorten the cycle of construction, how to tap the potential of and renovate and transform old enterprises and make full use of existing production capability, and how to adopt correct policies so as to arouse the enthusiasm of the masses and speed up

production and construction. Facts have proved that as long as we pay attention to economic results, fully use and tap the potential of existing enterprises and arouse the enthusiasm of the masses, we will be able to speed up the development of production, with little or no investment in capital construction, to a greater extent than if we were to make even bigger investments in capital construction. In the past 2 years, the amount of investment for capital construction in the budget has decreased, not increased. But as we have paid more attention to economic results, to tapping the potential of, renovating and transforming old enterprises and to making full use of the existing production capability, we have been able to speed up the development of industrial production. We have also all witnessed the results of expanding the decisionmaking rights of enterprises and correcting the tendency toward egalitarianism in distribution according to work that are shown in the arousing of the enthusiasm of staff and workers and in the development of production.

To increase the circulating funds of various trades means to expand accumulation. The volume of accumulated floating assets in accumulation funds has been tremendous over the past few years. Increases in the floating assets of many departments and trades have been excessive, but this capital has been used irrationally with a slow turnover. A number of goods and materials, particularly steel and mechanical and electrical products have been seriously overstocked, causing an excessive accumulation rate. Therefore, the accumulation of circulating funds must be properly decreased in the future. We have to speed up turnover, fix inventory standards, and resolutely change the situation in which there are too many links in the turnover and a serious overstocking of goods and materials. Rational reserves of goods and materials may be increased according to requirements, because they will be advantageous in regulating the implementation of planning.

We have drastically increased fixed assets and floating assets over the past few years, but with very bad economic results. During the first 5-year plan, each 100 yuan of accumulation funds on average brought 35 yuan of national revenue, but this figure dropped to 16 yuan during the second 5-year plan. Following the downfall of the "gang of four," we have stressed the importance of economic results in investment and an improvement has been made over the past 3 years. But in 1979, each 100 yuan of accumulation funds only brought 32 yuan for the national revenue. This figure was still below the highest level in the past and certainly did not represent any progress. Waste has been very serious in production, circulation and capital construction. The circulating funds for the enterprises under the system of ownership by the whole people is 300 billion yuan, and it is possible for us to save 5 percent if we pay attention ideologically and take effective measures. This 5 percent means 15 billion yuan, which is enormous. Our four modernizations will have hopeful prospects only when we consider economic results in increasing accumulation, consider the time for turnover when making additional investments and consider the formation of new production capability in carrying out new projects. Therefore, in readjusting the proportionate relation between accumulation and consumption and gradually and properly cutting down the previously excessive accumulation, it is necessary to oppose bureaucracy and working in extravagant ways and to strive for economic results. In the future, national economic planning must clearly define for various trades

technical and economic policies as well as strict and concrete technical and economic goals such as labor productivity, cost of products, time of construction, newly added production capability, cost of circulation of commodities, volume of consumption of goods and materials, cycles in the turnover of funds and profit rate of funds or cost. As in implementing production plans, all these must be subject to inspection and checking so as to guarantee the realization of the planning.

5. We Must Work Out Medium- and Long-Term Plans for the Development of the National Economy by Seeking Truth From Facts, Looking Forward and Backward and Keeping a Comprehensive Balance

With the exception of the economic rehabilitation period in the early days after the founding of new China and the economic readjustment in the early 1960's, we have experienced five 5-year plans over the past 31 years. With the exception of the first 5-year plan, which was formal, comparatively objective and formulated with comprehensive balances after repeated studies, the other four 5-year plans were not comprehensively and objectively planned but were just outlined. The third and fourth 5-year plans in particular were not able to come up with any specific plans because of the interference and sabotage by the Lin Biao and Jiang Qing counterrevolutionary cliques. It was even more difficult to work out annual plans during this period. No wonder some comrades said that "a year of planning is planned in a year." Thus, during this long period, there was neither complete and concrete medium-term planning nor long-term planning. We could only proceed without planning. As a result, the development of the national economy was characterized by blindness with big fluctuations in one year after another that led to serious damage and disproportionate relations.

Following the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee, the Central Committee decided in good time to study and work out medium- and long-term plans for developing the national economy. This measure is ultimately necessary and correct and has been warmly received by the whole party, army and nation. In studying and working out this planning, it is necessary to sum up experiences and draw lessons from the past, to get rid of the "leftist" ideology, to have lofty aspirations with farsightedness and definite goals, and to take serious measures to implement the plan. In arranging various main proportionate relations, it is also necessary to balance the labor force. In the past, we basically did not pay attention to this question and made serious mistakes. Many social and economic problems, including the relation between accumulation and consumption, have occurred because of the imbalance in the labor force. In working out a long-term plan, we must first of all work out the sixth 5-year plan, and in doing so, it is important to balance finance, credit, goods and materials and foreign exchange, to balance the labor force, and to do a good job in and include in the planning the scheme of birth control and to grasp reproduction of the labor force so that the growth of goods and material production will accord with the growth of population.

As a socialist country, our country basically has a planned economy and, therefore, it is necessary that the national economy develop proportionately and in a planned way. But we must understand that people's subjective knowledge cannot

totally accord with objective reality; therefore, it is neither easy nor possible for economic planning to completely reflect the constantly changing objective economic situation. The objective contradictions between social need and possibility and between accumulation and consumption will continue to exist for a long time. The struggle between these contradictions will push society forward and improve people's knowledge. Our task is to follow the Marxist theory of knowledge, narrow the gap between subjective knowledge and objective reality, correctly handle various contradictions and follow objective economic laws so as to push the four modernizations ahead stably and smoothly.

CSO: 4004/118

**CORRECTLY UNDERSTAND THE HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE PARIS COMMUNE--IN
COMMEMORATION OF THE 110TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARIS COMMUNE**

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 pp 21-26

[Article by Li Yuanming [2621 0337 2494]]

[Text] On 18 March 110 years ago, the masses of workers in Paris overthrew the bourgeois government headed by Thiers, and established the first proletarian regime in history. The Paris Commune existed for a short period of 72 days, during which the working people, as the creators of history, achieved great feats which shocked the world and handed down rich historical experience. The Chinese people have always cherished deep revolutionary sentiments about the Paris Commune and have taken it as a brilliant pioneer which impels us forward in both the democratic revolutionary struggle and the socialist revolution and construction.

Since the founding of the People's Republic, our country has achieved gratifying success in studying the historical experience of the Paris Commune. However, there are also signs of viewing this experience in a stereotyped way and in terms of absolutes. Therefore, we should study the historical experience of the Paris Commune more comprehensively and in greater depth, correctly understand it in the light of historical truth, and correctly carry it forward in our socialist practice.

What Are the Principles of the Paris Commune?

In 1852, in summing up the experience of the French revolution of 1848 and the coup of Louis Bonaparte, Marx put forward the theory that the proletarian revolution must break up and smash the old state machinery. In 1871, in summing up the magnificent practice of the Paris Commune as well as the lessons from its experiences, both positive and negative, Marx further put forward the principle of breaking up and smashing the old state machinery and practicing the dictatorship of the proletariat. Undoubtedly, this principle is of very great significance and occupies an important position in the Marxist theory of the state. Marx and Engels later adopted this basic experience as the only major correction to the "Communist Manifesto." This is the basic principle of the Paris Commune as well as an item of basic historical experience.

Nevertheless, over a long period of time in the past, certain works published in our country have merely emphasized this principle or summarized the experience as this single principle in discussing the principles of the Paris Commune. This is not completely compatible with the realities of Marx' summing up of the historical experience of the Paris Commune.

Marx summed up a number of conclusions from the historical experience of the Paris Commune in his book, "The Civil War in France." Aside from the principle of smashing the old state machinery, there are also such principles as the principle of internationalism as displayed by the Paris Commune, the principle that the people should be the masters of a country, the principle of the democratic republican system of government, the principle that the commune should also be a body that undertakes executive and legislative work, the principle that the responsible personnel of the commune at various levels must be elected, must be supervised by the public and can be dismissed at any time, the principle that the salary of an officer of the state should be equal to the wages of a skilled worker, and so on. The experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat tells us that whereas the principle of "smashing the old state machinery" is one of special significance prior to the seizure of political power by the proletariat, however, after such seizure of power, a different situation prevails. At this stage, the other principles of the commune (such as the principle that the people should be the masters of the country, the principle concerning the election and dismissal of government officials and so on) are obviously of particularly great significance. In the "Introduction" to the 1891 Edition of Marx' work, "The Civil War in France," Engels wrote: "From the very beginning, the commune must admit that when the working class assumes power, it cannot continue to employ the old state machinery to manage the country. So as not to lose the political power it has just gained, the working class should, for one thing, remove the whole old oppressive machinery which had previously been used against it. For another thing, it should declare that all of its own representatives and government officials can be dismissed at any time without exception, to insure that it can guard itself against them." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 2, p 334)

After the Paris Commune was bloodily suppressed by the bourgeois reactionaries, Marx said confidently in his speech at the General Committee of the International on 23 May 1871: "Even if the commune is destroyed, the struggle is merely delayed. The principles of the commune will exist forever and remain indestructible. Prior to the emancipation of the working class, these principles will emerge again." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 17, p 677) In these words of Marx, "the principles of the commune" in English, or "die prinzipien der kommune" in German, the word "principles" is in plural form. The words "zhexie yuanze" in Chinese also indicate plurality. Therefore, the "principles of the commune" do not merely refer to the principle we often talk about: the principle of breaking up and smashing the old state machinery by revolutionary violence and practicing the dictatorship of the proletariat. These principles actually refer to a series of principles. When Lenin elaborated in his book "The State and Revolution" on Marx' analysis of the historical experience of the Paris Commune, he also did not summarize the principles of the commune as a single principle, but derived a number of principles and explained in detail the democratic principles of establishing a new state machinery.

Practically speaking, when the dictatorship of the proletariat is established, if the principles of the Paris Commune are merely emphasized as being just the principle of smashing and breaking up the old state machinery by revolutionary violence and practicing the dictatorship of the proletariat, while other principles of the commune are ignored, then the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat will not be promoted. Our current task is to comprehensively understand the principles of the Paris Commune and study the wide-ranging experiences of the commune with a view to serving our country's four socialist modernizations program.

Was the Paris Commune a Sample of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat?

In the "Introduction" to the 1891 Edition of "The Civil War in France," Engels explained the nature of the commune thus: "Recently, the philistines of the Social Democratic Party have been scared to death on hearing about the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dear sirs, do you wish to know what such dictatorship is like? Please look at the Paris Commune: it is the embodiment of the dictatorship of the proletariat." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 2, p 336) The Paris Commune represented the first great practice of the proletariat in overthrowing bourgeois rule and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. With the appearance and existence of the new proletarian regime, the Paris Commune declared the doom of the old capitalist world and the rise of a new world. The October 1917 socialist revolution in Russia and the Chinese revolution of 1949 represented the continuation of the cause of the proletarian revolution which started with the Paris Commune. However, can we thus draw the conclusion that the commune was a sample of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

Marx and Engels could envisage the new state machinery of the proletariat which would replace the old state machinery when they considered the existence of the commune, the revolutionary practice of the Paris Commune in breaking up the main components of the old state machinery, the commune's social and economic policies which benefited the working class, as well as the position of the working people as the masters in the new regime. Marx said: "The real secret of the commune is that it is essentially a government of the working class. It represents the fruits of the struggle between the class of producers and the class of owners, and it is the political form which has finally been discovered to enable labor to be emancipated economically." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 2, p 378) It is in this sense that Engels described the commune as the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

We must also see that the Paris Commune was not a sample of the dictatorship of the proletariat but was only an incomplete form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. As Lenin said, the commune was the "seed" of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is owing to the historical facts described below.

1) What guided the course of the commune revolution was not the scientific socialism represented by Marx and Engels, but Blanquism and Proudhonism, and even neo-Jacobinism and Bakuninism. At that time, Marx' correct ideology exerted its influence only within a rather small sphere and played a role in certain particular measures. Both the Blanquists and Proudhonists, who exercised leadership

over the commune, had their own merits and errors. Although they were all loyal fighters for the revolution, they were not yet aware of the need for organizing a unified political party. They "wasted too much time on trivial routine business and personal disputes." They were "influenced not just by the workers alone, but by various other factors." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 33, p 226) The intense struggles among them substantially weakened the new regime. As a proletarian regime, the commune did adopt many measures which benefited the working class. However, its guiding ideology was often not clearcut.

2) Marx said: "The political rule by the producers cannot be compatible with the perpetuation of their status of social slaves. Therefore, the commune should eradicate those apparatuses of the economic base which make possible the perpetuation of classes, and hence class rule." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 2, p 378) However, actually the commune did not even intend to fully employ its own political power to expropriate the expropriators and did not harm in the slightest degree, not to say seize, the principal financial levers of the state machinery, namely, the banks, large enterprises, railway companies and so on. Therefore, it could not establish the new regime on a firm economic base. Engels thought that "it was a grave political mistake" for the commune not to seize the Bank of France. (Ibid., p 333)

3) The Paris Commune declared itself the only regime in Paris and considered itself empowered to enact laws. It thus expressed its intention to act as the central government of France. Nevertheless, the Paris Commune did not take resolute action to secure all the political power of the state, as happened later in Russia in the October Revolution. The commune did not opportunely order the occupation of the government mansion, did not apprehend the heads of the Thiers government, and did not intend to wipe out the reactionary armed forces of Thiers'. It allowed them to freely retreat from the central districts of Paris and move to Versailles. Thus, the old regime with its armies was merely ousted from the capital and was not smashed. Consequently, it could continue to exercise the functions of the state machinery in Versailles, very near Paris. Lenin said that the fact that the commune did not immediately attack Versailles indicated inadequate offensive action, inadequate knowledge and resolution about smashing the bureaucratic military state machinery and the bourgeois regime, and therefore inadequate knowledge and resolution about doing away with the coexistence of two regimes so as to enable the Paris Commune to change from a local regime into a national one.

These limitations indicate that, as an organ of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Paris Commune was not yet mature, and this in turn indicates that the consciousness of the proletariat in those times was not adequately developed. This is understandable. We cannot expect a proletarian regime of 110 years ago to surpass historical limitations, and should not idealize the dictatorship of the proletariat that was practiced by the Paris Commune, an incomplete and inadequate organ for this purpose. We should not take it as a sample of the dictatorship of the proletariat and mechanically copy a certain number of its measures. We must instead study the historical experiences of the Parisian workers, assimilate the lessons of their history, carry forward and develop their

enterprise, and further enrich the theory and practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

How Should We Interpret Marx' Praise of the Parisian Workers' Historical Initiative?

Marx highly appraised the Paris Commune and enthusiastically praised the Parisian proletariat by saying "What flexibility, what historical initiative and what a spirit of self-sacrifice they have exhibited!" ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 4, p 392) This shows that he paid great attention to the historical initiative of the masses.

The masses of people are the creators of history, and historical activities are the enterprise of the people. Marx' attitude of complete trust in the masses of people and enthusiastic support of revolutionary mass movements will forever be an example for us to emulate. However, can we conclude from Marx' praise of the Parisian workers' historical initiative that we should positively support each mass movement whatever its nature, trend of development and outcome? Should we think that the main trend of any mass movement is invariably good and is invariably compatible with the development of society, so that we must say that every mass movement is "very good," must enthusiastically welcome, praise and support it, and must not "find fault with" it in the slightest degree, lest we become people who distrust the masses and become "right opportunists" and "phony Marxists"? We believe that such a conclusion is one-sided and represents a wrong interpretation of Marx' correct attitude.

First, Marx and Engels never treated mass movements indiscriminately. They clearly negated the pan-slav "mass movement,"¹ which enjoyed extensive development during the mid-19th century. They called it a reactionary national movement, because it impeded the development of history. Late in the 1880's, the Boulanger movement,² which exerted great influence, appeared in France. This movement attracted a considerable number of the masses, and even such renowned socialists as Lafargue believed that it should be supported. However, right at the beginning of this movement, Engels said that although there were many followers of the Boulanger movement, it was not a genuine mass movement but was actually a disorderly, philistine and essentially chauvinist movement. Engels predicted the inevitable failure of this movement, and said that its failure would help clear the ground for the French class struggle. His prediction came true and the movement failed very soon and vanished for good.

Second, Marx' enthusiastic praise of the Parisian workers' spirit of initiative did not prevent him from coolheadedly analyzing and "finding fault with" the Paris Commune movement.

On 9 September 1870, Marx reminded the Parisian workers that because the proletariat was not yet strong enough, "amid the current crisis, when the enemy (the Prussian army--RED FLAG article author's note) is nearly knocking at the gate of Paris, any attempt to overthrow the new government will be a desperate folly." In those circumstances, the French workers' urgent task was to "calmly and resolutely take advantage of the opportunity provided by the freedom prevailing in

the republic to strengthen their own class organizations." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 2, p 350) In March 1871, when the workers launched an uprising, although the bad omen of cruel suppression still existed, Marx still rejoiced at the Paris Commune revolution. Nevertheless, he still maintained his prediction of the possible failure of the Paris Commune. In his letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht on 6 April, Marx said: "It appears that the Parisians will fail." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 33, p 202)

Why did Marx enthusiastically support and praise the revolution of the Paris Commune, which he predicted would fail? It was because the working class in Paris was forced to seize political power by force. They were forced by the bourgeois reactionaries to make a choice. They "either had to accept the challenge," make a great sacrifice, gain a victory which might be short-lived, with the consequent stimulation and tempering of the will of the working class to struggle, "or had to surrender without fighting," with the consequent dying out of the revolutionary movement of the working class under the pressure of the bourgeoisie. Marx firmly believed in the creativity and initiative of the working class, and firmly believed that although the Paris Commune movement might be cruelly suppressed and numerous leaders and participants might sacrifice their lives, the struggle of the working class against the capitalist class and their state machinery would be led by the revolution of the Paris Commune to a new stage and would become a new starting point of global historical significance.

Marx did not always use the most beautiful compliments in support of the movement at that time. Lenin said: "Marx has not hidden any single error committed by the commune from the proletariat." ("Collected Works of Lenin," Vol 12, p 103)

Below is a quotation from Marx, the first half of which has seldom been quoted in the past despite its great importance. The quotation is: "If it had understood a little common knowledge, the commune could have reached some sort of compromise with Versailles, which would have been advantageous to the whole masses of people. This was the only thing that could have been achieved at that time. If the commune had seized the Bank of France, the boasts of the Versailles element would have immediately gone bankrupt, and so on and so forth." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 35, p 154) It can be seen that Marx consistently held that, in the circumstances at that time, there was no hope of gaining victory in an uprising, and no uprising that was launched could have won final victory no matter what measures were taken. Therefore, he thought that to reduce the proletariat's losses, the commune could only have reached some compromise with Versailles which would have been favorable to the people of Paris. Of course, seizing the Bank of France could not have turned defeat into victory. However, it could have helped to force Versailles to accept a compromise. This proposition of Marx' reflects the organic integration of a revolutionary spirit with a realistic spirit.

Third, under socialist conditions there also exist various mass movements of a different nature. Therefore, we should also concretely analyze mass movements. Of course, we should try our best to support those mass movements which on the whole promote the development of social history and of the productive forces. However, we should also soberly analyze and fervently point out certain defects

and drawbacks in such movements, so that the mass movements can healthily develop on a correct path. On the other hand, if certain mass movements, whether they are spontaneous or are launched by those at the top, retard or even reverse the development of social history and of the productive forces, then we should not only "find fault with them," but should also oppose them with a clearcut stand, just as Marx opposed the pan-slav movement and as Engels opposed the Boulanger movement. Only thus can we show a Marxist attitude. It is definitely not a Marxist attitude to distort Marx' correct attitude toward the revolutionary mass movement of the Paris Commune and to employ such distortion to attack those members of the party and of the people who hold different views about a particular mass movement of the socialist society.

Did the Paris Commune Fail Chiefly Because Its Use of Violence Was Insufficient?

On 28 May 1871, the Paris Commune was bloodily suppressed after existing for 72 glorious days. Lenin said: "There must be at least two conditions for a victorious social revolution, namely, a high degree of development of the productive forces and an adequately prepared proletariat. However, both conditions were absent in 1871." ("Collected Works of Lenin," Vol 17, p 123) At that time, capitalism in Europe had just started to develop into imperialism and the capitalist world was rather stable. A revolutionary situation had not been formed in various European countries, so that the French revolution could not gain any powerful support. However, the French bourgeoisie could form a ferocious, even though short-lived, alliance with the German bourgeoisie, which yesterday had been the enemy. At that time the ranks of the French proletariat comprised mainly handicraft workers, who had not been aware of the need to accept Marxist theory and organize a unified Marxist political party, and had not been mentally or organizationally prepared for a cruel struggle. Moreover, because the German army and the Versailles army jointly encircled Paris, the commune movement could not develop into a national revolutionary movement and a worker-peasant alliance had not been formed. The isolation of the commune's struggle speeded up its failure.

Of course, the Paris Commune itself also committed certain grave mistakes, including not applying sufficient violence against the enemy. For example, it did not take advantage of its victory and strike the counterrevolutionary headquarters at Versailles. It let many good opportunities for wiping out the enemy slip away. The commune did not subordinate all other tasks to the military struggle for conquering the counterrevolutionary armed forces of Versailles, but adopted an extremely harmful posture of passive defense. It did not seize the Bank of France by means of its political power, and thus allowed itself to be weakened and the enemy to be strengthened. It did not take strong measures against counterrevolutionary activities and did not take proper measures against the counterrevolutionary newspapers and periodicals published in Paris, so that its own base was shaken, and so on. Obviously, if the commune had launched a resolute offensive against the counterrevolutionaries in Versailles and had suppressed the counterrevolutionary activities in Paris as the circumstances required, the situation would certainly have been much better. Nevertheless, the commune failed chiefly because the subjective and objective conditions were not ripe for it to gain final victory.

The use of violence must also be concretely analyzed. If violence were aimed at thoroughly and resolutely crushing the counterrevolutionary forces of Versailles, if violence were used to resolutely suppress those hostile elements who hid in the city to incite and organize counterrevolutionary riots, then such revolutionary violence should have been used without reservation and Red terror should have been used to combat White terror. However, if violence were used against those who merely disagreed with the commune's policies or were merely unwilling to cooperate with the commune, and in particular, if other factions in the commune were subjected to violence and resolutely suppressed, then the commune would have wavered. Many works on the Paris Commune blame the commune for not being sufficiently resolute in implementing the "law of hostages," for executing 64 hostages only when final defeat was imminent, and for being overly tolerant toward those members of the commune who held different views. Actually, such blame is unfair.

Generally speaking, seizing, detaining and executing hostages is not a normal means employed by the proletariat for struggling against the enemy. It is a defensive tactic to be used reluctantly under pressure from bourgeois reactionaries. The Paris Commune seized and executed the hostages not because they had committed crimes which deserved to be punished by death, but because it wanted to exert pressure on Versailles. Actually, Versailles was not sentimental about these hostages. On the contrary, Versailles attempted to arouse more frenzied resentment against the commune and to suppress it more cruelly on the pretext that the commune would execute the hostages. Therefore, it was quite rational for the commune to delay taking extreme measures against the hostages. It showed that the commune had not fallen into the enemy's trap.

Neither was the commune wrong to tolerate those in its own ranks who held different views and not to take extreme measures against them. In the great French Revolution, some famous revolutionaries (such as Brissot, Hebert, Danton, Desmoulins, (Xiao-mei-te) [5618 5019 3676], Robespierre, Saint-Just and so on) were sent to the guillotine by other revolutionaries. This was a tragedy which should have been avoided as far as possible in a revolution. In May 1871, the divergence between the "majority" and the "minority" among the leading members of the Paris Commune became very serious. The committee members of the commune who belonged to the "minority faction" issued a declaration which denounced the "majority," and this caused strong reactions. The newspaper PERE DUCHESNE called the "minority" "a handful of cowards," "a number of scoundrels," "despicable cowards," "renegades" and so on, and proposed arresting them, sending them to court for trial and executing them. The newspaper LA COMMUNE called the "majority" "clowns" and "renegades," and demanded "executing" "these headstrong and worthless people." Of course, the "minority faction's" issuing of the declaration, which represented a halt in splitting the ranks of the commune, was a very heavy blow to the commune and was a very grave mistake. Nevertheless, the "majority," which was wielding great power, did not take advantage of its political power to take extreme measures against the "minority" in order to establish its own "authority," but demanded unity and concerted efforts against the enemy. This policy of seeking common ground on major issues while tolerating minor differences helped prevent further dissension and internal slaughter. Subsequent facts proved that the commune committee members who belonged to the

"minority faction" remained brave soldiers who defended the commune. They should not have been put to death by the revolution. Proletarian revolutionary practice over the past 100 and more years had shown that we should not blame the commune for overly tolerating different opinions, but should assign special significance to this way of handling the problem adopted by the commune.

Engels said: "Whether in the field of natural science or historical science, we must proceed from the existing facts." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 3, p 469) At this time when we commemorate the 110th anniversary of the Paris Commune, this article is written in an attempt to proceed from the historical facts of the Paris Commune and study several problems concerning the historical experience of the Paris Commune, so that this historical experience can be correctly understood.

FOOTNOTES

1. Pan-slavism originated in such places as Prague in the earlier half of the 19th century. This movement was aimed at strengthening the cultural and political connections among various slavic nations, and included an attempt to rely on the strength of czarist Russia to free themselves from Austrian and Turkish rule and thus to establish their own national state. In the mid-19th century, this movement exerted considerable influence among southwestern and southern slavic nations. Concurrently, Russia also propagated pan-slavism on a wide scale, vigorously embellished the eastern slavic social system, vigorously preached the unity of various slavic nations in historical origin, religion, linguistic systems and so on, and advocated establishing a slavic monarchic federation with Russia as the leader of the alliance, that is, a great slavic empire, which was to be headed by the czar. The pan-slav movement was suited to czarist Russia's aim of outward aggression and expansion. It not only contradicted the overall interests of the European democratic movement, but greatly endangered the real emancipation and independence of various slavic nations. Marx and Engels thoroughly revealed the reactionary nature of this movement and said that "its aim was just to push the European boundaries of Russia westward and southward." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 18, p 492) Engels also said: "If pan-slavist unity is not pure illusion, it is Russia's scourge." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 6, p 201)
2. The Boulanger movement was started by General Boulanger, who was the French army commander from 1886 to 1887. In the past, he had participated in slaughtering the Paris Commune soldiers. Now he disguised himself as a friend of the working class and attempted to carry out political agitation, overthrow the republican system, and establish his own military dictatorship by means of anti-German revanchist propaganda and by exposing the scandals of the republicans who were in power. Under Boulanger's banner there was a congregation of people of various backgrounds, ranging from financial magnates to representatives of the backward strata of the working class. In this movement, the slogan of overthrowing the corrupt republic and the propaganda for revanchism could not only have possibly tempted a portion of the working

class to abandon an independent class struggle, but might have triggered off a Franco-German war which would have been fatally dangerous to France. To warn the French socialists against being misguided by this movement, Engels repeatedly analyzed it in depth. He said that once Boulanger "assumes power, he will be enslaved by his chauvinist program.... Boulanger is the embodiment of war; this is almost absolutely certain.... Therefore, to throw oneself into Boulanger's arms because of resentment against the radicals is tantamount to throwing oneself into the czar's arms because of resentment against Bismarck." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 37, p 115) Later, Boulanger was forced to flee abroad because his conspiratorial activities were exposed and the Boulanger movement died down before long.

CSO: 4004/118

BUILD SPIRITUAL CIVILIZATION BY PROMOTING THE 'FIVE STRESSES' AND THE 'FOUR BEAUTIFULS'

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 pp 27-29

[Article by Guan Xin (7070 2450)]

[Text] The task of building a modern and powerful socialist country which has a high degree of democracy and civilization, as put forward by the party Central Committee, is the fundamental historical mission for the whole party and the people of the whole country during the new period. The unfolding of activities to promote the "five stresses" and the "four beautifuls" is an important aspect in our work of building a socialist spiritual civilization; it is also an important task for us to accomplish.

As early as during the period of democratic revolution, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that we must not only build a China that is politically democratic and economically prosperous but must "change the China which has been kept ignorant and backward under the sway of the old culture into an enlightened and progressive China under the sway of a new culture." ("Selected Works of Mao Zedong," p. 624) This means that after winning victory in the new democratic revolution we must move on to the socialist revolution and, upon completion of socialist transformation, build China into a modern socialist country step by step. This modern country must not only have a powerful material foundation to enable the masses to lead a well-to-do material life, it also must have well-developed education and thriving science and culture so that everyone will have noble qualities and a revolutionary spirit. Without a high degree of spiritual civilization, we can never build a modern socialist country of the Chinese type. If our country were to become prosperous and powerful and the people became well-to-do, but there were not a high degree of spiritual civilization, then our socialist construction would be incomplete. We must not follow the road taken by the developed modern capitalist countries, which are rich materially and poor spiritually.

Socialist spiritual civilization not only includes the further opening up and advancement of man's wisdom, that is, the ability to know and change the world, but also includes the advancement of people's ideology. It means there must be communist ideals, beliefs and moral standards, the revolutionary stand, principles and discipline, comradely relations among people, and so on. Besides

making a continual effort to develop our cultural, educational and scientific undertakings, the most important task in our present endeavor to do a good job of building a socialist spiritual civilization is to further strengthen the work of ideological education, raise people's ideological consciousness and moral standards, improve the interrelationships among people, and restore and carry forward the fine social atmosphere and mental outlook of the postliberation days, so that new people and new deeds imbued with the communist spirit will constantly emerge. This is conducive to maintaining social stability and unity, encouraging the people to overcome difficulties with one heart and one mind, making a success of our economic readjustment and promoting the development of the four modernizations. Recently, the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, the CYL Central Committee, the All-China Women's Federation and six other mass organizations jointly proposed launching activities for civility and courtesy which center on the "five stresses" and the "four beautifuls," namely, stressing civility, courtesy, hygiene, social order and moral character, and beauty of the spirit, language, behavior and environment. This is a concrete form of socialist spiritual civilization and is an important task which we must properly grasp for a long time to come.

The "five stresses" and the "four beautifuls" are based on beauty of the spirit and stress on the moral character. Activities to promote the "five stresses" and the "four beautifuls" are designed to educate the people to attach importance to the cultivation of good thinking and sentiments, to cherish the state and the collective and to uphold party leadership and the socialist system so that they can carry forward the spirit of mutual assistance and cooperation, consciously maintain stability and unity, heighten their fighting spirit, actively take part in labor and work hard. In other words, to be upright and honest individuals who are useful to the people and to society. Without a doubt these extensive activities to promote the "five stresses" and the "four beautifuls" will help promote and strengthen the work of ideological education, constantly raise the level of people's ideological consciousness and moral character, and restore and carry forward the fine traditions and work style. In particular, many of today's young people have grown up during the 10 years of turmoil and have not received proper moral, intellectual and physical education. Some of them do not even have the least idea about civility and courtesy. Therefore, strengthening education and promoting the "five stresses" and the "four beautifuls" among the young people and teenagers will help them grow up healthily and better enable us to bring them up as socialist new people who possess ideals, moral character, knowledge and strong physiques.

Some people equate civility and courtesy with a "hypocritical bourgeois style." This is wrong. At the time when Lin Biao and the "gang of four" ran wild, they attached the "revisionist" label to civility, courtesy and moral training, equating "beating, smashing and looting" with "revolutionary acts." This was the height of folly. In fact, civility and courteous behavior are closely related to the development of social production and the social system. The civilizations of different eras have different contents and levels. As far as historical development is concerned, the civilization of capitalist society is far more progressive than the civilization of feudal society or slave society. But capitalist society is based on private ownership, which practices class exploitation and class

oppression. This in itself is extremely uncivilized. The bourgeoisie is greedy for money, false and selfish--on the surface it is the epitome of politeness itself, but actually it is full of deceit. Engels wrote, "The more developed," a capitalist society is, "the greater the need for its covering up the inevitable ensuing bad things under the mantle of love and whitewash or negate them--which, in short, means the habitual practice of hypocrisy..." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 4, p 174) Beneath the civilized veneer of capitalist society are hidden decadent and nasty acts. By advocating civility and courteous behavior, we mean promoting a socialist civilization that preaches what it says and matches words with deeds. Given public ownership and the abolition of the system of man exploiting man, socialist society has no conflicts on fundamental interests among the revolutionary ranks and among the people. This is in line with the great goal of achieving the four modernizations. Therefore, such a society can guide people's actions with communist ideas and moral principles and allow the establishment of the relations of mutual respect, mutual trust, fraternal unity and cooperation between men. A good heart is the basis of good conduct. Man's thinking must be synonymous with action. Therefore, the kind of socialist civilization and courtesy advocated by us is in no way equivalent to the "hypocritical bourgeois style." Instead, it is a continuation of the virtues of the laboring people in history and a part of our effort to achieve a socialist spiritual civilization.

Some people regard coarse talk and rude manners as an expression of the frankness of the laboring people. This is a misinterpretation. The proletariat is the most advanced class. Modern civilization has cultivated in it a sense of organization, a sense of discipline, and the spirit of unity and mutual help. The proletariat and the laboring people are most mindful of civility. Rude manners are not inherently related to the laboring people. Marx pointed out: "In the act of reproduction itself, not only do objective conditions change--such as a village turning into a city, a wilderness turning into a cultivated plot stripped of its forests, and so forth--but the producer himself changes with new kinds of products turned out, and also develops and transforms himself through production--creating new forces, new concepts, new forms of social intercourse, new needs and new language." ("Various Forms Prior to the Birth of Capitalism," separate edition, p 31) It can be said that the current spiritual civilization in the world originates from the laboring people's creation while nasty actions and habits are products of the social system of man exploiting man and man oppressing man. Some unrefined manners and habits among the masses of people under the socialist system are a reflection of the remnant poison of the exploiting class of the old society and are ugly things that have lasted because of ignorance and backwardness. With the development of social production and cultural training, we must continuously overcome and get rid of unrefined manners among the masses of people by energetically promoting the "five stresses" and "four beautifuls."

Influenced by the remnant poison of Lin Biao and the "gang of four," some young people believe that such things as disregarding of discipline, making trouble for no reason, acting recklessly, bullying the weak and so forth are heroic acts. They might also regard bad language and rude manners as "things not to be taken seriously." Such an understanding is wrong. A man's language and behavior are a

reflection of his ideological training and his moral outlook. Many things in everyday life seem trivial, but if people are inattentive and let them become bad habits, they will stand in the way of social progress. As an ancient saying goes, "Don't do an evil thing just because it is considered not very evil; don't refrain from doing a good thing just because it is considered not very good." Knowledge depends on accumulation. Good conduct depends on gradual cultivation. Young people must develop communist moral principles and sentiments and cultivate good habits, beginning from childhood and beginning with the seeming trifles of their words and deeds. Concerning communist education and behavior, Makalenko [a Russian educator and writer] said: "I watched several times how commune members behaved on a tram. Once, a commune member sat down. He did not notice me. I saw a man getting aboard the car. The commune member vacated his seat without seeing whom he was doing this for. He went to one side and did not trouble to find out who it was. Comrades, this is a healthy act, a beautiful act." ("On Communist Education," p 92)

Marxists hold that it is man's social being that determines consciousness. The progress of spiritual civilization must be based on material civilization. This is beyond the shadow of a doubt. But, under given conditions, what is consciously pursued by people, after being energetically promoted, can stimulate the progress of spiritual civilization. In the process of building and expanding the people's army, our party has put forward and gradually improved on the "three main rules of discipline and eight points for attention." This has not only helped to cultivate a fine work style among the people's army but provided an example to be followed by the masses of people. Now, so long as we energetically promote this, patiently carry out training, and cite the advanced and criticize the backward, we can surely make some achievements. In 1963, the party Central Committee cited Lei Feng as an example of a person shining with communist ideas and called for learning from Comrade Lei Feng. This aroused the masses of people, especially youths, to study, work and live like Lei Feng and emulate Lei Feng's development. The spirit of Lei Feng has been greatly developed to become an important mark of our country's healthy social trend. Why are we not now able to do what we could in the past?

To properly carry out activities concerning the "five stresses" and "four beautifuls," the party's style should become the model for the style of the people. As the ruling party, our party occupies the leading position in the great socialist cause. The party's image in people's minds and the good or bad style of the party not only has a bearing on the party's survival or extinction and the success or failure of the socialist cause, but also directly affects the social trend. In the more than 12 years before the "Great Cultural Revolution," our healthy social trend won praise from the people of the world. The reason was that, apart from our giving full play to the superior features of the socialist system, the good party style asserted itself as a dominating factor. At that time, the overwhelming majority of cadres and party members put the people's interests first, placed public above private interests, thought of others first, and wholeheartedly served the people. Through their own exemplary acts, they influenced and led the masses. Exactly because the overwhelming majority of party cadres and party members played an exemplary role, our social trend reached the most healthy level in our country's history. Now, we must restore and

cultivate healthy social practices, create a new civil and courteous style, and achieve socialist spiritual civilization. To this end, we must use the party's style to influence the people's style, just as we did in our past revolutionary practice.

After the Russian victory in the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out that, in fighting ignorance and uncivilized and crude practices left over from the old society, we "can only rely upon lasting and effectual work and the sustained influence of the advanced segment (such influence is warmly hailed by the masses)." ("Selected Works of Lenin," Vol 3, p 816) The Communist Party and CYL members are the advanced segment among the masses. Every victory in our revolutionary struggle has been achieved by relying on the common struggle of these advanced elements in properly carrying out the party's correct line, developing the revolutionary spirit and uniting the masses of people. In working for socialist spiritual civilization, we must also rely upon the masses of Communist Party members and CYL members in starting right now and beginning with themselves and with every trifle in doing the following: They must promote the kind of enthusiasm and revolutionary spirit displayed in the period of the revolutionary war. They must devote themselves heart and soul to the people's cause. They must act as pacesetters in achieving material civilization and socialist spiritual civilization. They must use their lofty communist spirit and virtuous conduct to influence the masses and educate the young people. In sum, under the leadership of party committees and governments at all levels, all departments must devote themselves to "lasting and effective work," adding topsoil, pruning away branches, irrigating and applying manure for the benefit of the garden of socialist spiritual civilization. The aim is to make the flowers of socialist spiritual civilization to compete in blooming all over the vast land of China.

CSO: 4004/118

THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF WRITERS AND THE SOCIAL EFFECTS OF THEIR WORKS

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 pp 30-35, 7

[Article by Wei Jianlin [5898 1696 2651]]

[Text] Since Comrade Deng Xiaoping, as a representative of the party Central Committee, put forth the question of the social effects of literary and art works in his speech at the fourth conference of literary and art circles in 1979, and after Comrade Hu Yaobang further expounded on this question at the forum on script writing in 1980, it has become a popular topic in many articles on the theory of literature and art and at literary and art forums. This question has aroused widespread concern, and it is very opportune and necessary to put forth and illustrate this question. The discussions for more than a year have made considerable efforts to show that the social effects are not simple but are complicated, and have shown that the social effects should not be based on the likes and dislikes of a small number of people but should be judged according to the historical practice of the masses of people. The study of the question in this way helps deepen our understanding of the relation between literature and art and reality. Such study must be continued.

However, as far as the relation between the social responsibility of the writers and the social effects of their works is concerned, it is very difficult to say that it has already aroused sufficient concern and that there has been thorough and systematic investigation. A study of social effects in isolation from this aspect will inevitably be one-sided. Here, we shall emphatically study this aspect and appropriately consider other relevant questions.

I

We now face an excellent economic and political situation and an excellent situation in literature rarely seen in the more than 30 years since the founding of the country. The emergence of this situation is the outcome of implementing the guiding thought of the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee on seeking truth from facts and rectifying leftist errors. However, after the 3d Plenary Session adopted the important resolution on shifting the focus of the work of the whole party, there should be more specific instructions on the position to be occupied by literature and art in the construction of socialist modernization, the role they should play and how they should accomplish the task they have been given by our era. This is precisely one of the basic problems

that the fourth conference of literary and art circles said must be solved. This is also precisely the principal background of the question of the writers' responsibility and the social effects of their works put forth by Comrade Deng Xiaoping and Comrade Hu Yaobang. In accordance with the actual conditions of society in our country and the particular laws governing literature and art, the party and the government have highly praised the work of writers and artists, and at the same time have earnestly hoped that they would establish deep roots among the people, consciously nurture themselves with the people, consciously nurture themselves with the vigorous spirit of the people, provide people with the best spiritual food and prompt people to undertake the historic creative activities of modernization. Because of this, we have no alternative but to raise the question of the writers' responsibility to the people. They should solemnly consider the social effects of their works and should strive to make their works beneficial to the cause of modernization. No matter whether in satisfying or improving the people's spiritual life, in reflecting the great era, or in molding and nurturing socialist new people, the writers and artists shoulder an important responsibility which they cannot shirk.

Generally speaking, the social responsibility of writers is first of all related to the process of creation, while the social effects of their works are related to their actual role and influence after the completion of the creative process. Their works are all social phenomena produced on the basis of reality.

Literature, as an ideology, has ties with reality in two aspects: It comes from reality. Once it emerges, it plays a certain role in reality. No materialists, not to mention Marxists, would think there is justification for cutting off these ties. A work is a kind of dialogue between the writer and the reader and an exchange of feelings and ideas. Any work, as long as it goes from the desk of the writer to society, will be read and assessed by people and will exist as a link in the social relationships. It is bound to, in various forms and to varying degrees, unobtrusively and imperceptibly change and influence the spiritual world, thoughts and feelings, concepts of morality and esthetic tendencies of the readers, clarify or confuse their understanding, purge or contaminate their souls and permeate their practical activities. Certainly, this will not be a direct process in which the outcome is known immediately like "a pole that casts its shadow upon the ground the moment it is erected." Since literary works reflect reality through all kinds of contacts, since they do not provide any doctrines, principles or creeds but unfold a living, perceptual and realistic picture, since the position, experiences, ideological realm and artistic training of the readers are varied, it is obviously incorrect to simply judge the effects of the works with a formula such as: if it is not this, it must be that; if it is not good, it must be bad. The problem is that we cannot from this deny their social effects, or provide an agnostic or mystic explanation. In this, Marxism precisely reveals its tremendous ideological force. Marxism is not an ossified standard or criterion which can be applied everywhere; it has put forth the sole scientific method and path for examining the social effects of literary works. This mainly means that we have to compare facts with facts, which means to examine to what extent the facts in life depicted in the works correctly reflect or distort the objectively existing facts in life and the depth and breadth of life. In the many-sided relations and incessant movement in society,

we have to judge whether the things reflected in the works and the thoughts and feelings of the writers imbued in such works conform to the interests and demands of the broad masses of people. We must grasp the readers' reaction to the works and the total objective influence of the works, analyze whether they conform to the orientation of historical development and whether they help to develop the socialist spirit and culture. The key to such study lies in how to recognize the metaphorical system of the works and the main direction of the outcome which they lead to in the course of social practice, or the general trend.

We should not deviate from facts to exaggerate or unduly minimize the social effects of literary works. If we ignore the Marxist scientific attitude, it is not difficult to find offhand examples which prove that outstanding works have a negative influence while inferior works have a positive influence. However, precisely because literature occupies an important position in social life, different social forces at various times are bound to put forth this or that demand on literature and are bound to consciously, semiconsciously or subconsciously link literature to their own interests and undertakings. Advanced classes, strata or cliques require literature to give impetus to the development of society as far as possible in accordance with their own laws. Progressive literature also makes use of its own achievements to meet such inevitable demands in history. The literature, with its opposition to the dark rule of the Dark Ages as the banner of its thought, which emerged in the Renaissance vigorously promoted the dissemination of bourgeois revolutionary thoughts in some European countries. The realist literature created by Pushkin and Gogol in the 19th century in Russia, with Belinskiy, Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevskiy as its spiritual leaders, became an important force in the broad social movement to overthrow the serf system. The trend of progressive literature represented by Lu Xun since the May 4th Movement and many outstanding writers such as Guo Moruo, Mao Dun, Ba Jin, Cao Yu and Lao She all along accompanied the emergence, development and victory of the new democratic movement. Although certain writers brag about transcending society and reality and although we cannot easily grasp the internal connections between some literary phenomena and the social movements at first glance, the literature of an era, not only in its entirety, but also in its parts and branches, cannot but openly or latently, clearly or obscurely exert its influence on reality to a varying extent, following the development of history. Although the works of writers are individual works, no matter whether the writers admit it or not, they all belong to a certain social force and use their pens to actually participate in certain social activities.

We cannot require writers, before and at the time of writing, to know thoroughly and clearly and to correctly assess the social effects of their works as if all subjective purposes of the writers could be meticulously realized. We cannot depart from the entire metaphorical system of the work to examine in isolation the direct utilitarian aim of the writer in the use of every term and the depiction of every detail and character. Tricks such as suggestive remarks, allusion and dissection of words to expose a latent meaning have existed since ancient times. Lin Biao and the "gang of four" used these tricks to stifle literature and art and persecute the writers, which led to extremely serious evil consequences. As far as criticizing literature and art is concerned, there are still

similar phenomena at present. For example, if a certain work has criticized a bureau chief, not only this bureau chief, but bureau chiefs in the place where the writer is and in the place of the publication of the work will be disturbed and infuriated and they will take steps to chastise the writer. This shows that some comrades fear the exposure of their incorrect actions and their ignorance of artistic laws. This is also an important reason for their arbitrary intervention in literature and art. It is absolutely necessary to criticize these comrades and rectify their brutal acts of arbitrary intervention. However, this does not mean that the writer has the right to write thoughtlessly and fabricate events. For the revolutionary and progressive writers who have literary ethics, creation is after all not a personal, but a social, historical undertaking of the people. A serious and responsible attitude is not only a common feature in their personality but is also the [underlining begins] minimum requirement [underlining ends] which guarantees that they can make outstanding literary achievements. Perhaps nobody would say that Balzac did not understand artistic laws. However, he specifically stated, "The task which every writer should take up is to educate the people of his time. Otherwise, he is only [underlining begins] a person who entertains people." [underlining ends] ("Collected Translations on the Theory of Literature and Art," 1975 edition, Vol 2, p 38; emphasis is in the original text) Gogol hoped that people would, through reading his works, mock the devil as far as possible. "Believe me, no matter what artistic works are published, if they do not contain questions that are pertinent in society today and if they cannot depict the characters needed by us today, they would not exert any influence today." ("The Militant Tradition in Literature," p 144) In order to bring literature closer to the people, Leo Tolstoy sharply criticized some writers in the upper class society at that time. "These people originally aimed at serving spiritual food to those people who support them, feed them, clothe them and exempt them from labor. Is it not the most serious case of madness that they forget their own responsibility and forget to create food which is useful to people and regard their irresponsibility as their virtue?" ("Anthology of Literary Research," Vol 4, p 338) In a letter Gorky said that in the course of writing, he was bound to ask the reader in his heart, "What kind of feelings in life do I call up in your heart, which is like a tattered dustcloth? Under the influence of my writing, what kind of achievement beneficial to life do you want to make?" ("Literary Correspondence," Vol 1, p 61) He was perplexed as to whether his works could prompt his readers to undertake activities beneficial to life. Lu Xun said that the copies of his published works were increasing and he was willing to see this. However, this feeling was also mixed with worry and sorrow, because he feared that this increase would be harmful to the readers. Consequently, he was even more cautious and hesitant in the course of writing. "I remember that 3 or 4 years ago, a student came to buy my books. He took money out of his pocket and put it in my hand. The money still carried the warmth of his body. This body warmth has left a mark in my heart. Up to now, whenever I write, I constantly fear the harm youths of this type." ("Written Behind the 'Graveyard'") He called on that writers become revolutionaries and use literature to push forward the new democratic revolutionary movement at that time. This is known to everybody.

The writers mentioned here lived in different eras and faced different social problems. They had different ideological and artistic tendencies. However, the

facts mentioned below have repeatedly provided evidence for their literary activities and for the entire history of the literature of mankind: All great writers are writers who are responsible toward society, the people and history. All great literature linked with their works is a developed and victorious body of work which, through a unique artistic form, defends the truth in life, speeds up the destruction of old things and the birth of new things. If the great literary men in the past paid a tremendous price under extremely difficult social conditions and through long periods of struggle and exploration, and consciously or semiconsciously made their own contributions, we cannot say that it is too much for society, the people and history to put forth higher and higher demands on our writers after we have been armed with Marxist ideology and the socialist system has brought about unprecedented prosperity in our literary undertakings. There are a thousand reasons for writers who dedicate themselves to socialist literature to strive to realize such demands and there is not a single reason for them to reject these demands.

II

No matter whether starting from the May 4th Movement or from the Yan'an forum on literature and art, modern and contemporary literature in our country has all along had a fine tradition, which is to build close ties between the revolution and construction, and between the national and people's liberation and the prosperity and strength of the motherland. The question of the social responsibility of a writer has emerged from these ties. Owing to the development of "leftist" things in the ideological and political realm, we have had a one-sided understanding of this tradition. A well-known assertion is that literature and art are the tools of class struggle and so on. In the "Great Cultural Revolution," this one-sided understanding reached its acme. The aim of rectifying erroneous leftist thoughts now is to return to the correct understanding of this tradition and absorb more rich literary experiences so as to inherit and develop this tradition in accordance with the new social conditions.

Some people say that it is apriorism to put forth social effects, arguing that the effects can only be seen after the work has been completed and examined through practice. Here, two points are worth consideration. First, the ultimate and essential distinction between mankind and the animal world is labor. Animals can only adapt to the external world but cannot put the mark of their willpower on it. Human beings can, through their own labor, continue to consciously raise their understanding and power to grasp the external world, and in practice, manipulate and change the external world. Just as Marx said in "Das Kapital," the ability of bees in building a beehive makes many architects feel ashamed. However, the worst architect is from the beginning superior to the most skillful bee. To the architect, "the result obtained at the completion of the labor process has existed in the imagination of the worker right from the beginning of this process, that is, it has already existed conceptually." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 23, p 202) Although in practice, the original assumption might change, the ability to make assumptions beforehand is the mark of mankind's superiority. Literary creation is a kind of spiritual labor and its conditions are even more complicated. The first aim of literary creation is the completion of the work. However, after its completion, there is obviously an even deeper

aim, which is the influence of the work on reality. We should say that the characters and the plot in the work are often different from what the writers first intended. The social effects of the works are sometimes not those expected by the writer. The problem is that the writer cannot or is unable to consider the social effects of the work before its completion and examination in practice. Then, there is no way to talk about what to write and how to write it. To say that such a consideration is apriorism is no different from basically negating the role and value of existence of any ideological form. Next, just as human society is a continuous process, the social effects of literary works, the people's understanding of such effects, and the role between literature and life are also a process. For works which are being contemplated or have just been started, it is not only possible but also necessary to roughly predict the kind of reaction which its issue or publication will bring about. The basis of this prediction is the social and literary reality of our times, the accumulation of the social history and literary experiences in the past, and the history of the relation between literature and society. We certainly cannot acquire a correct understanding if we negate this point and separate literary activities from the practical activities of mankind and from the evolutionary process of social history and the history of mankind. If we put such a demand for creation on the writer, we will truly move toward apriorism.

Socialist literature, which serves the people and socialism, should put the interests of the people and revolution above everything. No progressive and revolutionary writers should shirk the social responsibility which they are bound to shoulder. They should not forget but should as far as possible consider the social effects produced by their works. They must strive to attain the social effects demanded by the people. If a writer harms society and the people with his works, the broad masses of people have the right to criticize and even condemn his works. Is there any objection to this?

Some people say that the responsibility of the writer is to depict reality and record what is seen and that this is unrelated to the effects of the work. They recognize the responsibility of the writer in the first aspect of the contact between literature and reality, which is the depiction of reality, but do not recognize his responsibility in the second aspect of the contact between literature and reality, which is the development of an active role in reality. This is an incorrect understanding of the concept of depicting reality. Literature is a real realm. Within this realm, hypocrisy, lies, deceit and affectation can only bring failure and disaster. However, the depiction of reality, which is a basic principle in realism, inevitably requires the writer to select, refine, generalize and typify people and events in life. Literary work is not a commodity or a journal which records in any form anything that is seen. If it was really like this, the invention of the camera and the tape recorder would have meant the death of literature. Literature has not died but is constantly developing precisely because it realistically reflects life by artistic means. At the same time, it is creating a new life which appeals to people and causes people to fight for it. Balzac talked about his mental process in the course of writing, "Before writing, the writer should analyze all characters, see through all kinds of personalities, go around the world, experience different kinds of feelings.... Everything should go through his thoughts.... Perhaps he has actually seen the

world, or has consciously developed it in his soul.... The writer should see all the objects to be depicted, no matter whether the object approaches him or he approaches the object." He calls this "the creation of truth through analysis." (Leonid Ivanovich Timofeyev: "Principles of Literature," p 48) For the progressive and successful writer at least, the responsibility to realistically reflect reality in the hope that the work will exercise a favorable influence on reality will permeate the entire process of contemplating and creating the work. Without this responsibility, we cannot talk about the realistic reflection of reality, just as an untrue reflection of reality cannot make the work exercise a favorable influence on reality. If someone says that the responsibility of the doctor is only to give prescriptions and is unrelated to the patient's health or life, or that the responsibility of the driver of a vehicle is only to drive and is unrelated to the existence of the vehicle and passengers, I think that comrades who advocate that the writer's responsibility is to depict reality but is unrelated to the effects of the works definitely will not consult such doctors or ride in vehicles driven by such drivers.

Let us talk about the true nature of realism. The present situation is that we have not been able to obtain positive views from all sides even on whether to recognize realism. For example, some articles call a number of obscure poems written by some young people in recent years the main trend of poetry in our country and say that this is the emergence of a new poetry and represents our future. They assert that the birth of these poems will inevitably cause a breakthrough in esthetics and we must, therefore, hail the emergence of the new esthetic principle. This new esthetic principle is the so-called self-expression. Therefore, the question is no longer how to assess these poems or judge the position of the poet in these works and the question is not to recognize whether the obscure mood created in certain lyrical poems can give people esthetic enjoyment. The question is whether it promotes the ties between reality and literature or pulls them apart and can even be summed up as merely the self-expression of the writer. If we sum up literature merely as self-expression, the social responsibility of the writer is bound to be wiped out entirely. We should admit that the following shortcomings have existed in our literature both in policy and in theory for a long time. We have not paid attention to the full development of the personal artistic imagination and creativity of the writers, we have not encouraged them to explore and form a unique artistic style and means of expression, but have insistently required them to simply make life reappear in order to illustrate political concepts which have not been fused with their souls, feelings and thoughts, or to compile cheap eulogies. These shortcomings still need to be further overcome. However, although nothing depicted by the writer can be separated from the writer himself, we cannot simply view the works as the sum total of the personal feelings of the writer. The more the writer follows the rhythm of the time, absorbs nutrition from life and forms his creeds, ideals and esthetic tendencies on the firm foundation of reality, the more deeply he puts such a subjective mark on his works, the more he will show his responsibility toward the social effects of the work and attain outstanding achievements. The subjectivity mentioned here is not the small circle of the personal life and feelings of the writer but is the extraordinarily vast objective world which has been individualized and artistically grasped. The writer should never be satisfied with reciting personal feelings but must strike a deep root in people's life

and in the torrent of historical development. In his talks with (Ai-ke-man) [1947 0344 2581], Goethe pointed out that a person can only be called a poet if he can grasp the world and manifest it and not only express his subjective feelings. Balzac thought that the writer must become "the center of the wisdom of ten thousand things." ("Collected Translations on Classical Artistic Theory," 1962 edition, Vol 3, p 168) Heine said, "My heart is the literary treasure of German feelings." ("Baltic Sea," p 138) Leo Tolstoy repeatedly reminded writers to embrace life in their own subjective things. Gorky pointed out: The writer is the echo of the world. Do not put the focus on yourself but focus the whole world on yourself. In his eyes, Tolstoy was the great soul which contained the whole of Russia and all Russian things and the entire world. "He has summed up the experiences of the entire century and made a summary with alarming accuracy, force and beauty." ("History of Russian Literature," p 505) All outstanding writers should make certain contributions to the literature of their nationality, society and even the whole of mankind which are exclusively linked to his personal spiritual labor. The development of literature never excludes the writer's own exploration, discovery and other personal factors. On the contrary, if the writers really take reality as the base and strive to grasp the people's internal social ties and the objective trends in historical movement in their works, the role of such personal factors is bound to be directly proportional to the thoughts and artistic achievements of the writers. In our process of modernization, literature must be accompanied by the tremendous liberation of the personal artistic creativity of the writer. However, we must not go back to the old path of self-expression, which will inevitably lead to poverty, decadence and regression in literature, as has already been proved by the history of Chinese and foreign literature and, in particular, certain Western bourgeois cliques in this century.

Since literature is summed up merely or mainly as the self-expression of the writer, some people make freedom in creation an absolute. It seems that as long as there is no arbitrary intervention in what the writer writes and how he writes it, this means that the writer will write what he wants to write and he can write in the way he chooses, and means that it is a sacred right to do as one pleases and that this right is absolute and cannot be touched. Any criticism--including correct analysis, well-intentioned advice and guidance, and rational suggestions--is using the big stick on the writers. They have not seen this simple fact: for those who view literature as self-expression, neither the writers themselves nor their works can stand outside society. For example, although the so-called writers in the capitalist society, whose profession is to manufacture spiritual poison, might describe this as self-expression and achieve peace of mind, in fact, they are only using their own works to suit the psychology of the capitalists, benumb and poison the people under the manipulation of the purse strings of capitalists and capitalist commodity laws, and achieve the effects of reinforcing the economic exploitation and political rule of the capitalists. They have also forgotten this simple truth: there is no right without obligation and there is no unrestricted freedom. Through the struggle against Lin Biao and the "gang of four," and the rectification of the "leftist" erroneous guiding thought, the party and the people have returned to the writer the right of creation, and they respect and protect this right. They give the writer the freedom of creation and they respect and protect this freedom. It is the responsibility of every writer to value and

correctly make use of this right. True freedom can only be produced in the correct understanding of reality and conscious protection of the interests of the masses of people. We can never obtain this freedom if we confine our vision to the small world of our personal job and our sorrow, gratitude and grudges, if we are unable or unwilling to look for the enthusiasm and inspiration for creation in the great ocean of the people's understanding and destiny of our mother country, and if we are ignorant and indifferent toward the objective process of social changes and historical processes and take the side of the backward social forces. Not to mention anything else, the wings of our artistic creativity will be broken, and, right from the beginning, it will be rigidly restricted by our narrow perspective and aspirations.

We might well review Deng Xiaoping's hopeful words in his celebration speech at the fourth conference of literary and art circles: "Literary and art workers who are responsible to the people must constantly face the broad masses of people and try to achieve excellence in art and guard against turning out works in large quantities without any regard for quality. They must strive to render contributions to the people through providing them with the best spiritual food." The modernization under way will lead to profound changes in various aspects of our society, including the people's mode of living, way of thinking, feeling, and way of appreciating beauty. This is a process of building up an advanced material culture and also a process of building up an advanced socialist spiritual culture. In this, our literature shoulders an extremely difficult and heavy task. All writers with socialist awareness and all patriotic writers who love our nation will strive to shoulder the important tasks which history and the people have given them, and they have no reason to adopt a careless and irresponsible attitude in their serious literary undertakings. Writers nurtured with the milk of the Chinese people should never and will never be out of a job. In the rich and varied literary and art works, it is the pride of writers in socialist China to promote the stability of the country and unity of the people, struggle against all backward and decadent things, educate people on beauty and assist them to actively forge ahead, cultivate healthy sentiments and educate them on lofty morality.

CSO: 4004/118

A GUIDE TO UNITING THE INTELLECTUALS--STUDYING THE EXPOSITIONS ON THE QUESTION OF INTELLECTUALS IN VOLUME 1 OF THE 'SELECTED WORKS OF ZHOU ENLAI'

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 pp 36-39

[Article by Zhu Tongshun [2612 0681 7311]]

[Text] The question of intellectuals is an important one concerning the Chinese revolution. In the glorious course of participating in and leading the Chinese revolution, Comrade Zhou Enlai paid close attention to the question of intellectuals. Applying the basic principles of Marxism, he profoundly summed up the lessons of past mistakes in line regarding the question of intellectuals and concretely expounded the position and role of intellectuals in the revolution. Together with such comrades as Mao Zedong, he formulated a correct policy for our party regarding intellectuals, and in practice, united with and led the comrades at various levels to take part in revolutionary struggle and step up the tempo of revolutionary victory.

Chinese Intellectuals Are a Motive Force of the Revolution

At different stages in the development of China's new democratic revolution, the revolutionary alliance was sometimes expanded and sometimes contracted in line with the changing of the chief enemy. However, regardless of the stage, the revolutionary alliance with workers and peasants as the mainstay always included intellectuals, and intellectuals were one of the motive forces of the Chinese revolution. Applying the Marxist method of class analysis, Comrade Zhou Enlai profoundly analyzed the characteristics of Chinese intellectuals and expounded their position and role in the democratic revolution. He pointed out: "The urban petit bourgeoisie is also a basic force in the ranks of the new democratic revolution." ("Selected Works of Zhou Enlai," Vol 1, p 212) He also further pointed out that the typical representatives of urban petty bourgeoisie were intellectuals. On the eve of the nationwide liberation, Comrade Zhou Enlai made a high appraisal of the revolutionary role of intellectuals. He said: "The victory of the people's liberation war depends on the People's Liberation Army and on the people's democratic united front formed by the peasants, workers, intellectuals and all patriotic democratic personages." (Ibid., p 350)

Chinese intellectuals have a deep historical origin as a motive force of the revolution. In examining the history of contemporary China, we can clearly see that the Chinese people had been suffering from the aggression, bullying and

humiliation, pillage and oppression of imperialist powers since the Opium War of 1840, and China had gradually become a semicolonial and semifeudal country. Opposing imperialist aggression involved countless difficulties, undaunted efforts and heroic struggle on the part of the disaster-ridden Chinese people, and they made many heroic and inspiring achievements. Under such circumstances, most of the Chinese intellectuals took the patriotic stand of opposing imperialist aggression and safeguarding national independence and sovereignty. Because of this patriotic stand, most of them were able to continue to advance, accept revolutionary proletarian ideas, take the road of integrating with and serving the workers and peasants, and join the ranks of the people's revolution. In all previous revolutionary movements since the Revolution of 1911, intellectuals had always been the most conscious class. In the famous May 4th and September 12th movements, the masses of young students were the first to rise up and struggle heroically at the forefront of these movements, and they played the vanguard and bridging role in these movements. As a result of being tempered in these movements, many advanced elements discovered revolutionary truth, threw themselves into the protracted revolutionary struggle against imperialism and feudalism, learned Marxism-Leninism by actual practice, overcame nonproletarian ideas, gradually matured into proletarian revolutionaries and made important contributions to the liberation of the Chinese people.

Most of the intellectuals in old China were exploited and oppressed by feudalism and the bourgeoisie. In the old society, apart from a handful of reactionary intellectuals who were bent on serving the reactionary ruling class, most of the intellectuals in various professions and trades had to toil all year round without getting enough to eat and wear. At times, they were compelled to discontinue their studies and were threatened by unemployment. Their position was no different from that of the workers and peasants. Therefore, they all had a strong aspiration for revolution. During the liberation war, Comrade Zhou Enlai pointed out: "At present, not only the masses of workers and peasants in the Chiang-dominated area cannot carry on, but the petty bourgeoisie and civil servants also cannot carry on." (Ibid., p 276) Therefore, the "antiwar, anti-hunger and antipersecution" mass movement, which started in the Chiang-dominated area with hundreds of thousands of students and intellectuals taking part, was a powerful revolutionary force. This second anti-Chiang front effectively coordinated with the victorious advance of the People's Liberation Army. History has clearly shown the tremendous role played by Chinese revolutionary intellectuals as a motive force of the revolution and the glorious chapter they have written in the history of the Chinese revolution.

Excluding and Attacking Intellectuals Is a Characteristic of the Leftist Line

During the second revolutionary civil war, after overcoming the right opportunist line of Chen Duxiu, our party had three cases of the leftist line. Even if the manifestations of the three lines were different, their common feature was to deny the revolutionary spirit of the urban petty bourgeoisie and to exclude and attack intellectuals.

In summing up the experience of the "sixth CCP congress," Comrade Zhou Enlai pointed out: "The 'sixth congress' does not clearly understand the urban petty

bourgeoisie. Although it recognizes the revolutionary role of the urban petty bourgeoisie, it holds that only workers and peasants are the motive force, and eliminates the petty bourgeoisie.... As a result, it has made a mistake from the standpoint of tactics." ("Selected Works of Zhou Enlai," Vol 1, p 163) This mistake of the "sixth congress" resulted in the first leftist line placing undue emphasis on cadres of worker origin and continuing the mistake of excluding intellectuals. Moreover, this was further developed in the second and third leftist lines. Under the guidance of "leftist" ideas, a wrong policy was adopted toward the intellectuals.

The leftist line of excluding and attacking intellectuals was manifested in the organizational line of the party centered on the theory of the unique importance of class origin.

First, it called for the inclusion of workers in leadership organs and excessively and unduly emphasized that leadership cadres must be purely of worker origin. Comrade Zhou Enlai pointed out: "After the '8 July' meeting, we have regarded the struggle against opportunism simply as the dismissal and replacing of personnel. This kind of formalism subsequently has had an effect on including workers in leadership organs, regarding worker cadres as idols and making no distinction in the treatment of intellectual cadres. At that time, Comrade Li Lisan, who was secretary of the Guangdong Provincial Party Committee, said: The role of intellectuals is over. Henceforth, we will only rely on worker and peasant cadres." (Ibid., pp 180-181) This erroneous guiding idea gave rise to the phenomenon of excluding intellectual cadres from the CCP Central Committee down to the various base areas and White areas.

Second, because of the emphasis on worker origin in the election, many workers were elected members of the CCP Central Committee. Comrade Zhou Enlai said: "Of the 36 members of the CCP Central Committee elected at the 'sixth congress,' 21 are workers.... Many of the intellectual cadres emerged during the May 4th Movement. They have done a great deal of useful work and have quite a bit of experience. Because of the overemphasis on worker origin, many relatively good intellectual cadres are restricted from taking part in the work of the Central Committee." (Ibid., pp 185-186) "This had a bearing on the weakness of the subsequent Central Committee." (Ibid., p 186)

Furthermore, excessive sectarian inner-party struggle had begun. The third leftist line inappropriately promoted some dogmatic and sectarian comrades of the "left" to membership in the CCP Central Committee and unduly attacked and punished a number of comrades who had made the mistake of the Lisan line and the comrades headed by Qu Qiubai who had made the so-called mistake of the "compromise line," most of whom were intellectual cadres. At that time, more than 20 important cadres who had done a great deal of useful work for the party and people, including so-called "rightists" Lin Yunan, Li Qiushi and He Mengxiong, were attacked. Not long after they were attacked, they were arrested by the enemy. They showed unyielding heroism before the enemy and all died under the enemy's sword. Even Comrade Mao Zedong, who had been leading the "Red Army" in the action against "encirclement and suppression," was relieved of his leadership post in the "Red Army." Comrade Zhou Enlai was also

criticized for making the mistake of "compromisism" and attacked. "This set of methods" of the leftist line was forcibly extended to various revolutionary bases and White areas, and it did great damage to the party's cause.

For a period after the "sixth congress," Comrade Mao Zedong not only developed in practice the line of the "sixth congress" in the correct direction, but also correctly solved the problems which this congress did not or could not correctly solve. Similarly, in announcing the correct direction for the line of the "sixth congress," Comrade Zhou Enlai at the same time began to expose and correct the shortcomings and mistakes of the "sixth congress." Three months after the closing of the "sixth congress," when Comrade Zhou Enlai was preparing the draft for the fourth part of the "Report to All the Comrades" released by the CCP Central Committee for implementing the resolutions of the "sixth congress" (included in the "Selected Works" under the title "Resolutely Eliminate All Nonproletarian Ideas in the Party") and, in light of a manifestation of the leftist line, he pointed out: "It is very wrong to turn opposing opportunism into opposing the intellectuals." ("Selected Works of Zhou Enlai," Vol 1, p 10) There were not many intellectuals in economically and culturally backward old China. At that time, there was an urgent need for intellectuals in the revolutionary war and for the construction of base areas, and many revolutionary intellectuals had played a very good role in the struggle. What then was the reason for excluding the intellectuals? Based on the specific conditions at that time, Comrade Zhou Enlai analyzed the cause of this mistake. He pointed out: "Such viewpoints are basically still petty bourgeois ideas." (Ibid.)

Petty bourgeois one-sidedness makes no concrete analysis of things but pinpoints a small area of a plan and one side of a whole. Comrade Zhou Enlai used dialectical materialism to penetratingly criticize this metaphysical viewpoint. He said: "Although many intellectuals have vacillated, quite a few of them are able to struggle on the side of the proletariat. Among the proletariat, there are also many who have lost their proletarian consciousness and become contaminated by petty bourgeois ideas. Many comrades do not understand this principle. Therefore they do not talk about opposing petty bourgeois ideas but concentrate on opposing individuals with a bourgeois background. This has resulted in a demarcation between workers and educated people in the party and has increased inner-party disputes." ("Selected Works of Zhou Enlai," Vol 1, p 10)

It is quite easy for the petty bourgeoisie to give rise to or accept dogmatism, and this has been an important reason for the incorrect handling of the intellectuals. There is a great difference between the intellectuals of the Russian revolution and the intellectuals of the Chinese revolution. Lenin on numerous occasions pointed out: "Although it may seem strange, many learned people are putting up stubborn resistance to us." ("Collected Works of Lenin," Vol 28, p 415) This was the phenomenon under the historical condition of the Russian revolution. Under the concerted attack by imperialist and White bandit armed forces, the intellectuals openly engaged in slowdowns, firmly resisted the socialist revolution and caused great difficulties to the newly founded Soviet regime. Therefore, the Soviet regime was more severe in criticizing the intellectuals. Even though this was the case, Lenin still did not advocate abandoning the intellectuals, but called for "securing complete command over all school

teachers" and not just "weeding out the incorrigible bourgeois counterrevolutionary elements." (Ibid., Vol 29, p 107) The Chinese intellectuals had thrown themselves into the revolutionary struggle with the attitude of masters of the house. Group after group of their advanced elements had joined the revolution ranks and made self-sacrificing struggle for the cause of the people's liberation. They had long been people on the side of the revolutionary ranks and there was no reason whatsoever for excluding and attacking them! What we should point out in particular is that, under the influence of the leftist line, many intellectuals were treated unfairly and attacked. However, they still had confidence in the inevitable victory of the revolution, stubbornly worked and struggled and even laid down their lives without complaint. This is something the Chinese intellectuals can be proud of!

The Zunyi meeting brought an end to the domination of the leftist line and established the leading position of Comrade Mao Zedong in the whole party. When the war of resistance against Japanese aggression started, our party summed up historical experiences and formulated the correct line and policy. In the resolution "Recruit Large Numbers of Intellectuals" drafted for the CCP Central Committee, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out: "All our comrades must understand that a correct policy toward the intellectuals is an important prerequisite for victory in the revolution. There must be no repetition of the incorrect attitude toward intellectuals which party organizations in many localities and army units adopted during the agrarian revolution." We must firmly bear in mind the experiences and lessons which we have paid for with blood.

A Glorious Example of Uniting With Intellectuals

In the long process of participating in and leading the Chinese revolution, Comrade Zhou Enlai always attached great importance to the work for intellectuals and he was a glorious example of uniting with the intellectuals.

When Comrade Zhou Enlai was in charge of the Eighth Route Army office in Hankou in 1938, he attached great importance to organizing and mobilizing the young students and people of the intellectual circles to join the revolutionary ranks, and also sent large numbers of progressive young people to the Chinese People's Anti-Japanese Military and Political University in Yan'an, and to the public schools in north Shaanxi and the anti-Japanese base areas in north China and south of the lower reaches of the Changjiang River. Comrade Zhou Enlai also personally organized the intelligentsia of the White area to take part in patriotic democratic movements and to support the revolutionary war. When he was working in Wuhan, Chongqing and Nanjing, he made use of every available opportunity to make friends with people in the cultural, scientific and technical and commercial circles, college professors and young people. He worked diligently, united with people of the intellectual circles and democratic personages, developed one mass struggle after another against the imperialist and Kuomintang reactionaries, attacked the enemy and continued his development.

While leading the struggle in the White area, Comrade Zhou Enlai paid close attention to protecting the safety of well-known personages and patriotic intellectuals. In July 1946, when the Kuomintang reactionaries sent their secret agents to

assassinate progressive personages Li Gongpu and Wen Yiduo, Comrade Zhou Enlai was filled with indignation. At a press reception held in Nanjing, he openly exposed the enemy and solemnly pointed out: "These were absolutely calculated and brazen political assassinations," and warned the Kuomintang reactionaries that they must "mend their ways." ("Selected Works of Zhou Enlai," Vol 1, p 237) In view of the murder of Li and Wen and the death of Tao Hangzhi, who died from overwork and excessive strain, Comrade Zhou Enlai proposed to the CCP Central Committee: "We must assume responsibility for protecting the safety and well-being of our progressive friends" and "also look after them politically from time to time." (Ibid., p 238)

Comrade Zhou Enlai also showed great concern for the political growth of intellectuals and stressed the remolding of nonproletarian ideas. As early as during the period of the May 4th Movement, young Comrade Zhou Enlai in an article entitled "Innovation and Reformation of the Heart" resonantly raised the slogans of "Remold society" and "Remold the mind." In view of the fact that intellectuals could easily become divorced from reality and the masses, Comrade Zhou Enlai pointed out: "Mental workers should learn from physical workers. One of the outstanding features of mental workers in general is individual labor (naturally many of the activities of singing groups, drama societies and film studios are of a collective nature), and this can easily give rise to a noncollectivist tendency." ("Selected Works of Zhou Enlai," Vol 1, pp 349-350) He called on the intellectuals to exert themselves in emulating the collectivist spirit of the working class. He advocated study and rectification in actual struggle. In "Views on the Problem of Rectification for Cultural Workers in the Vast Rear Area," Comrade Zhou Enlai emphatically pointed out that guiding the people of the cultural circles in carrying out all kinds of struggle against the Kuomintang authorities during the development of the democratic movement "is also a very good form of rectification. Otherwise, abstractly debating world outlook and outlook on life might even give rise to unnecessary debates on historical problems, and this will inevitably result in the slackening of the struggle against the diehards in the Kuomintang and cause internal disputes." (Ibid., p 188)

Comrade Zhou Enlai stressed that we must trust the intellectuals and must make friends with the intellectuals and democratic personages, and "all public figures outside the party who can be won over and who can cooperate with us should be looked upon in the same manner as cadres in the party." (Ibid., p 327) Comrade Zhou Enlai earnestly practiced what he advocated, and he became a good teacher and friend to many intellectuals and democratic personages. During the winter of 1946, in view of Li Siguang's anti-Chiang stand and in order to protect him from persecution, Comrade Zhou Enlai arranged for him to take temporary refuge abroad. When the People's Republic was founded, Comrade Zhou Enlai proposed him to be a vice chairman of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. There were rumors at that time that Li Siguang might not return. Based on his knowledge of the man, Comrade Zhou Enlai believed that he would return and also instructed that the first national geological conference not be held until Li Siguang's return. When Li Siguang, who was on his way back, heard that, he was deeply touched.

The contributions made by Comrade Zhou Enlai in theory are rich and profound. Studying Comrade Zhou Enlai's expositions on the question of intellectuals

will enable us to thoroughly understand the party's correct policy toward intellectuals, further overcome the influence of leftist ideas and make greater efforts in the struggle for building China into a strong modern socialist country with a high degree of democracy and civilization.

CSO: 4004/118

UPHOLD DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 pp 40-45

[Article by Zhu Gu [2612 0942]]

[Text] Democratic centralism is the basic organizational system for our party and also for our state. How this system is introduced has a direct bearing on improving dictatorship and developing the democratization of the state, and on whether socialist modernization can be successfully realized. A basic problem in improving the leadership system for the party and the state is to further improve and better introduce democratic centralism.

To uphold democratic centralism is to persist in unity of democracy and centralization. This calls for not only fully developing democracy but upholding centralized leadership. Experience shows that it is very wrong to split this unified whole into two parts, set them in opposition and emphasize one while negating the other, or negate both of them. Doing so will impair and even disrupt democratic centralism, causing serious losses to our revolutionary and construction efforts.

In the political life of our party and state, such phenomena as imposing an individual's word as law, patriarchal behavior and individual dogmatism have so far remained serious obstacles to the improving of democratic centralism. To change this phenomenon we must persist in developing democracy and socialist democracy within the party. But we must guard against going to another extreme, that is, the negation of centralization based on democracy and on centralized leadership.

The socialist cause cannot be separated from the centralized leadership of the proletarian revolutionary political party. The combination of a high degree of democracy and a high degree of centralization is an important guarantee for the realization of correct party leadership. Without full democracy we cannot achieve correct centralization and real unity. Without a high degree of centralization the party cannot form into a unified whole and cannot achieve unified will, unified command and unified action and, still less, strengthen its fighting power. Marx and Engels not only paid a tremendous amount of attention to developing democracy within the party but, at the same time, attached great importance to centralized unity. They repeatedly stressed the necessity of

obeying authority and resolutely opposed anarchism that negated obedience and authority. They held that anyone who adhered to such an absurd concept was actually serving a reactionary group. The "Regulations for the League of Communists" personally worked out by them embodied the principle of unity between democracy and centralization. The regulations clearly called for the realization of full democracy within the league. Various committee members must be elected and be subjected to dismissal at any time. The regulations were left to the discussion of various branches and then referred to the congress for examination and approval. The regulations also clearly said that a high degree of centralization must be achieved. All league members must maintain unity with the league politically and "bring their way of living and their activities in line with the league's goals"; they "cannot join any anticommunist (political or national) body"; they must "obey all the league's resolutions," and so forth. ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 4, p 572) Anyone who acted against these rules was considered to have "committed an offense against the league" and must be "ordered to temporarily leave the league, or be dismissed from the league, depending upon the circumstances." ("Collected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 4, p 576) Lenin concisely pointed out that centralized party leadership was of decisive significance to the socialist cause. He stressed leading the whole party's activities with a high degree of centralization as represented by the party Central Committee. He also clearly pointed out that the proletarian revolutionary political party must introduce centralism. This idea on centralism should permeate the whole party's constitution. But this centralization was built on the basis of democracy and was therefore also called democratic centralism. He stressed that before a resolution was decided upon on all important problems, the leadership must fully encourage free discussion and free criticism on a comprehensive scale among the masses of party members. Such democracy must be chiefly limited to the extent of 1) not violating the party's general program and acting "within the limitations of the principles of the party's program" ("Collected Works of Lenin," Vol 10, p 412); and 2) not interfering with unified actions that had been decided upon. Once a resolution was approved by the party the whole party must unconditionally obey and observe it and must quickly and realistically execute it. Lenin pointed out: "We must clearly recognize the great differences that set apart democratic centralism from bureaucratic centralism and from anarchism." ("Collected Works of Lenin," Vol 27, p 190) Our party and our people's democratic dictatorship have been built on the basis of this Marxist organizational principle. Experiences in practice, both positive and negative, have fully shown that to give full play to democracy and socialist democracy within the party is not to weaken but to strengthen proper centralized unity of the party and the state; and that to correctly strengthen centralized party and state leadership does not hamper but safeguards the development of democracy and socialist democracy within the party.

An extremely small number of people obsessed with bourgeois liberalization and influenced by anarchism negate socialist democracy that calls for centralization and for party leadership. They pursue so-called absolute freedom devoid of leadership, devoid of centralization and devoid of any restraint.

This is entirely a distortion of democracy. In fighting anarchists, Engels pointed out long ago that in any social organization there must be authority and

obedience in any given joint action. The historical and realistic conditions of the development of democracy have also told us that any version of "democracy" devoid of leadership, devoid of centralization and devoid of obedience just does not exist and is also not allowed by any ruling class or group. Without leadership, without centralization and without obedience, there can be no unified will or unified action and no class can exercise and maintain its own rule or realize and develop its fundamental interests. Bourgeois democracy is not without leadership. The bourgeois political party (regardless of whether one, two or many parties are involved) or group exercises leadership. There is also no lack of centralization. There is the centralization of the bourgeois will. Nor is there a lack of obedience. Within the bourgeoisie, a minority is made to obey the majority and the workers and other laborers representing the overwhelming majority of the people are forced to obey the rule of a minority through the means of dictatorship. This, in the words of Marx and Engels, is to "subordinate the whole society to conditions that help the minority to get rich." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 1, p 262) In a bourgeois country, the constitution or laws formulated by the bourgeoisie on the basis of democratic principles are a concentrated expression of bourgeois will. It is exactly the constitution or laws that define the nature, scope and procedures of bourgeois democracy and consolidate the bourgeois democratic system and order. The nature of proletarian democracy is basically contrary to that of bourgeois democracy. Proletarian democracy is really democracy for the working class and the masses of people. This kind of democracy is inseparable from the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary political party and from centralization. Under the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary political party the proletariat and the laboring people must concentrate their forces and carry out organized struggle. Only in this way can they break away from their plight of being oppressed and enslaved to "become the ruling class and achieve democracy." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 1, p 272) This principle has been proved by the entire sweep of history covering the victory achieved in the Chinese revolution by the people of our country under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. After the victory in the revolution, only by unifying our own will and actions under the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary political party were we able to establish our own state, elect our own government, establish our own legal system, exercise effective dictatorship over the enemy of the people, and protect and develop our own political and economic interests. This principle has also been proved by the period of history in which our people, under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, abolished the old system of man exploiting man and established a new socialist system that called for complete equality, fraternal unity, and mutual cooperation among the people. The constitution and laws formulated by the proletariat and the whole people through centralization based on democracy under the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary political party are a concentrated expression of the will of the proletariat and the whole people. Such a constitution and laws geared to the needs of the whole people and based on socialist principles spell out the pattern of behavior for all members in society, and, for the whole people, chiefly define the nature, scope and procedures of people's democracy, that is, socialist democracy, and maintain the socialist system and democratic order. The viewpoint that socialist democracy can go without party leadership, without centralization and without obedience is completely wrong.

In a socialist country like ours with a population of 1 billion, only by achieving a high degree of centralization and upholding centralized leadership on the basis of full development of democracy can we insure the correct direction of socialist democracy, insure the centralized unity of the party and the state, and insure socialist democratic order. Why? First, the principle of the minority obeying the majority cannot be separated from what politics represents. It is either an embodiment of bourgeois democracy or an embodiment of proletarian democracy.

Under the actual conditions of our country, despite the exploiting classes having been eliminated, class struggle still exists. This is due to the influence of historical factors and international circumstances. Given ever increasing international exchanges, the influence of Western bourgeois democracy is inevitably brought to bear and the tendency toward bourgeois liberalization has appeared. The anarchist trend of thought brought about by Lin Biao and the "gang of four" has so far not been completely eliminated. An extremely small number of people bent on making trouble raise the banner of "achieving democracy and freedom" to carry out sabotage. This still represents a factor not to be overlooked at present--a factor that hampers the development of socialist democracy and the strengthening of the socialist legal system and disrupts stability and unity. If we, faced with this situation, refrain from promoting centralization based on democracy and from promoting centralized leadership, then we cannot insure the development of democracy in the socialist direction. Second, we have introduced democratic centralism precisely because we want to insure centralized party and state leadership. This is to integrate the whole party and the people of all nationalities of the country into a unified and organized force fighting for the great socialist cause. Given a big country like ours with its vast area, its large population and its varied regional conditions, the national guideline, policies, instructions and resolutions of the central authorities can only be based on the general conditions of the whole country. On this basis, common principles are put forward. It is impossible to lay down rigid rules about all problems for all areas and all departments. This calls for giving localities and lower levels ample decisionmaking power, so that they can decide on and cope with problems in light of the actual conditions of the locality or unit concerned. But when deciding on and handling problems in light of their actual conditions, various localities and units cannot run counter to the central instructions and resolutions. Nor can they break away from the centralized leadership of the central authorities; otherwise various localities and organizations will follow their own course without independently as separate entities. This will naturally bring about many independent kingdoms, both large and small, and interfere with and even disrupt party and state unity. Moreover, any version of democracy is marked by the established order. Only in this way can it be realized and developed. At present an important task confronting our whole party and the whole population is to introduce democratic institutions and laws. Institutions and laws are an embodiment of centralization based on democracy. They are in turn used to establish and consolidate normal order, where inner-party democracy and socialist democracy are universal. In the absence of such normal order, with anything asserting its disruptive role, democracy cannot be developed. From this, it can be seen that as far as our inner-party democracy and socialist democracy are concerned, centralized leadership is indispensable.

One argument for negative centralized leadership is that centralized leadership can only disrupt democracy. Is this really so? This depends on what centralization is like. "Centralization" represented by feudal despotism and bureaucracy has a really disruptive effect on democracy. Examples abound in real life of this version of what seems to be centralized leadership but is actually individual dogmatism. But this, after all, is in essence not centralization based on democracy. It cannot be lumped with real centralization. We seek to get rid of the despotic phenomenon disruptive to democracy. This is exactly an attempt to realize correct centralized leadership based on democracy and not a desire to negate and abolish it. For a long period of time people have often lumped "centralization" with individual dogmatism and equated "centralization" with the arrangement of letting the leaders issue commands and orders to be followed by others. They have often separated democracy from centralization, associating democracy with ordinary people and the lower levels and centralization with leaders, and equating the practice of letting others air their views with the realization of democracy or equating the arrival at decisions by leaders (regardless of whether such decisions are compatible with the views of the majority) with the realization of "centralization." They often set so-called concentrated correct views in opposition to the concentrated views of the majority.

In the name of "concentrated correct views," they exclude the views of the majority, actually not recognizing the views of the majority that are correct under normal conditions. Sometimes what is advocated by a minority may have been correct. But before it is accepted by the majority, it should not be imposed upon the majority as something to be followed which would be upholding "commandism." This erroneous idea has so far been exerting its influence on certain people. This situation has resulted, on the one hand, in some leaders practicing dogmatism in the name of centralization; and on the other, in some comrades using opposition to personal dogmatism as an excuse to basically negate centralized leadership. This idea that negates centralized leadership is in fact the manifestation of the faulty reasoning of equating "centralization" with despotism. Its advocates actually refuse to recognize that in real life, apart from "centralization" related to feudal despotism, there will exist centralization related to democracy. Centralization related to people's democracy does not exclude or disrupt proletarian democracy. On the contrary, it safeguards the development of democracy along the socialist path. What it excludes and disrupts is despotism disruptive to democracy, and also democracy that deviates from the socialist path, such as so-called democracy marked by a bourgeois tendency toward liberalization.

Another argument for negating centralized leadership is that since making the minority obey the majority is a combination of democracy and centralization, it is senseless to impose centralized leadership on democracy, which means subjecting democracy to its own leadership. This conclusion based on abstract logic seems plausible but is actually wrong. It cannot embody the complicated phenomena in actual political life. Democracy and centralization, though interdependent and interrelated as parts of a unified whole, are not one and the same thing. They are instead two different aspects of a whole. Making the minority obey the majority is not without a precondition, namely, that everyone must

fully air his views and even engage in argument and controversy. On this basis, all views are concentrated, with the majority achieving a consensus and arriving at a resolution or decision. Only then can we talk about obedience, compliance and execution. As far as obedience is concerned, what is expressed is not the democratic aspect of democratic centralism but the centralization aspect of this system. Meanwhile democracy and centralization are introduced within different scopes. Apart from making the minority obey the majority within a certain organization, there is also the problem of the lower-level organizations obeying the higher-level ones and the various organizations across the nation obeying the central authorities. The party Central Committee and party committees at all levels are democratically elected at the national party congress and local party congresses at all levels. For the lower-level organizations, the higher-level ones or the central authorities are an organ exercising centralized leadership and represent a still greater majority. Their decision is centralization based on democracy within a still larger scope. The lower-level organizations must resolutely follow it. The implementation of a higher-level organization's decision at the lower levels is by no means an interruption or discontinuation of democratic life. Instead it is a continuation or extension of democratic life under another set of circumstances. In discussing how to carry out the instructions and resolutions of the central authorities and higher levels in light of actual local conditions, the lower levels must also follow the principle of the minority obeying the majority and give full play to democracy. Such democracy is exactly democracy practiced under the leadership of the central authorities and the higher-level organizations. For example, during the closing period of a congress, party committees at all levels, guided by the instructions of the higher-level party committees and resolutions of the congress at the same level, discuss major problems within the scope of a given area and work out decisions. Isn't this also democracy? Isn't such democracy practiced under centralized leadership represented by the instructions of higher-level party committees and the spirit of congress resolutions?

Also, the "PRC Organizational Laws for Local People's Congresses at All Levels and Local People's Governments at All Levels" state: "Guided by the concrete conditions and actual needs of the relevant administrative area and by the state's constitution and its laws, policies, decrees and programs which are not to be compromised, people's congresses of provinces, autonomous regions, and municipalities directly under the central government may formulate and promulgate local laws and regulations and refer them to the NPC Standing Committee and the State Council for their records." Being able to negate the laws and regulations formulated and promulgated by local people's congresses is democracy. Is this not democracy under the centralized leadership of the state?

Still another argument for negating centralized leadership is that "centralization" can mean democracy under the leadership of an individual leading cadre. Such a phenomenon reflects confused thinking in the minds of some people. Just as mentioned above, some comrades have lumped centralization based on democracy with individual domination. Thus at the very mention of centralization, they think that this is no more than imposing what an individual leading cadre says as the law, or an approach that calls for something along the lines of imposed conformity to what an individual says as the law. In fact, by centralization we

mean "centralization based on democracy." This kind of centralization covers the party's constitution, its program, line and general and specific policies and the instructions and decisions of party organizations at all levels, and covers the state's constitution and its laws and decrees, the resolutions of local people's congresses and their standing committees, and so forth. They are formulated within different scopes, through such procedures as democratic discussion, with the views of the majority concentrated. They must also be observed and carried out by the whole body of people concerned within the scope of an area where they are applicable. The views of individual leaders can never replace this kind of centralization based on democracy. Though leaders can often put forward very good and very brilliant views compatible with the will of the majority, they cannot be taken as substitutes for official upper-level decisions or instructions, or equated with "centralization," before the consensus of the majority is achieved or before an organizational decision is made. This represents the original meaning of this concept of "centralization." Faced with people's wrong ideas about it, we should strive to make things clear and restore its original meaning, instead of throwing it to the winds. Just as fish eyes have been palmed off on us among pearls, so we must throw away the fish eyes alone and not also the pearls in anger.

In sum, to negate "centralization based on democracy" and make democracy deviate from centralized leadership is theoretically wrong and harmful in practice.

Whether or not upholding democratic centralism is in essence a fundamental problem of whether or not to uphold centralized party and state unity, the historical experiences of our party and state have repeatedly shown that whenever we have practiced correct centralized unity on the basis of the development of democracy, our revolution and construction efforts develop smoothly. Whenever we have disrupted centralized unity based on democracy, our undertakings suffer. To triumphantly realize the great task of readjusting the national economy and realize the party's current general tasks and to build a modern, highly democratic and highly civilized powerful socialist country, we must uphold centralized party and state unity and firmly and unwaveringly uphold democratic centralism.

CSO: 4004/118

LEARN FROM LENIN'S EXEMPLARY WORK STYLE OF CORRECTLY HANDLING DIFFERING VIEWS WITHIN THE PARTY

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 pp 44-48

[Article by Wu Liping [0702 7812 1627]]

[Text] Correctly handling differing views within the party is the key to the implementation of democratic centralism and the realization of collective leadership. This question is particularly important to the ruling proletarian regime. The history of the past 30 years shows that our advancement in this aspect has followed a tortuous course. From both successful and unsuccessful experiences, we have learned a profound lesson: Developing democracy within the party and correctly handling differing views are of great significance to the strengthening of socialist democracy, to the insurance of the party's correct leadership, to the smooth progress of the party's work, to the reduction of mistakes, and particularly to the prevention of mistakes in line. The method of handling this problem has a great bearing on the destiny of the party and state.

Since the smashing of the Lin Biao and Jiang Qing counterrevolutionary cliques and particularly since the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee, we have created favorable conditions and done a great deal of work to restore and develop democracy inside the party and to strengthen socialist democracy. The implementation of the "Guiding Principles for Inner-Party Political Life" adopted at the 5th Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee has energetically promoted the development of inner-party democratic life. However, the pernicious influence of Lin Biao, Jiang Qing and company should not be underestimated. Feudal and autocratic ideas, which have prevailed in China over several thousand years, are still exerting influence on us. Some current malpractices of the party and state should not be overlooked. Thus, patriarchal behavior, dictatorial acts and acts to suppress democracy are quite common. Moreover, some people are trumpeting the ideological trend of anarchism. They are attempting to disrupt the democratic life inside and outside the party from another angle. We must pay serious attention to this. Thus, the conscientious implementation of the "Guiding Principles for Inner-Party Political Life" is an important task at present.

The party's general task at the present stage is to build our country into a modern socialist power having a high degree of democracy and civilization. We

must extensively listen to the opinions of cadres, experts and the masses in various sectors, fully mobilize the creativity and enthusiasm of the masses inside and outside the party and give play to the collective's wisdom and strength. Only in this way can we gradually realize this great yet arduous task. Therefore, learning from Lenin's exemplary work style of correctly handling differing views inside the party is of major significance to the development of democracy inside and outside the party and to the upholding and improvement of party leadership.

The communist cause is a great cause for which millions of revolutionaries and the broad masses of people have been struggling. This cause cannot be realized by a single person or a few persons. Even great leaders like Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong could do only part of the work in this great cause. Moreover, they also made mistakes of one kind or another. Lenin said: "He is not wise who makes no mistakes. There are no such men nor can there be. He is wise who makes not very serious mistakes and who knows how to correct them easily and quickly." ("Collected Works of Lenin," Vol 4, p 192) In order to avoid mistakes, particularly major mistakes of principle, all revolutionaries, particularly party leaders, must pool the wisdom and efforts of all people, formulate correct strategies, tactics, principles, policies, give full play to all people and adopt correct measures. Those who refuse to listen to people's opinions and who act arbitrarily will be rebuffed and butt their heads against a wall.

This truth has been verified by countless facts in the history of the international communist movement and in the history of our party. Among proletarian revolutionary leaders of a ruling party, Lenin set a brilliant example for us in correctly handling differing views.

From the time Lenin joined the revolution and particularly after he assumed leadership in the revolution, he listened attentively to other people's opinions. He accepted and developed the correct ones. On the other hand, he criticized and corrected the wrong ones. As a result, he was able to pool the people's wisdom, uphold the correct line and principle and avoid mistakes, particularly major mistakes, on the basis of developing democracy. In inner-party political life, he set a good example of convincing people by reason rather than by coercion or by exposure and criticism. This is extremely important to party members, particularly those in leading positions. This is also what they should try to do. If people are not allowed to express differing opinions in party organizations and in revolutionary ranks, if those who express different opinions are attacked, framed or even persecuted politically and organizationally, can party members still enjoy basic democratic rights? How, then, can we realize socialist democracy?

Lenin said: "Democracy means equality." ("Selected Works of Lenin," Vol 3, p 256) He did not only verbally and theoretically stress the spirit of equality, he also practiced this spirit in his actions. As a party leader, Lenin earnestly practiced what he advocated, exemplarily practiced collective leadership and implemented inner-party democratic centralism. Although rulers of the exploiting class occasionally listen to other people's opinions, they reject and denounce those views which are not in the interest of their class or not in their own

interests. They may even accuse people who hold these views. They are not as democratic as naive people may think. In fact, there is no democracy at all. Only proletarian leaders oppose the lack of democracy and equality and lead the people to eliminate the material basis of the lack of democracy and equality, and to realize the highest degree of proletarian democracy. However, due to the change of status and power and due to the influence of the force of habit of the old society, not every proletarian leader practices the spirit of the proletarian democracy as Lenin did.

Generally speaking, there are two kinds of differing views within the party: One is the correct kind, the other is the wrong kind. Lenin always eagerly listened to the correct views. If he was wrong, he would admit his mistakes on his own initiative. For example, Lenin decided to formulate specific principles on the new economic policies only after he had conscientiously listened to the opinions of the broad masses of peasants, particularly peasants who were nonparty members. In the article entitled "Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution," Lenin openly explained: "We reckoned--or perhaps it would be truer to say that we presumed without reckoning adequately--on being able to organize the state production and the state distribution of products on communist lines in a small, peasant country directly by an order of the proletarian state. Experience has proved that we were wrong. It appears that a number of transitional stages are necessary--state capitalism and socialism--in order to prepare--to prepare by many years of effort--for the transition to communism. Not directly relying on enthusiasm, but aided by the enthusiasm engendered by the Great Revolution, and on the basis of personal interest, personal incentive and business principles, we must first set to work in this small, peasant country to build solid gangways to socialism by way of state capitalism. Otherwise we will never get to communism: We will never bring these scores of millions of people to communism." (Ibid., Vol 4, pp 571-572) Here, Lenin not only boldly admitted his mistakes, he also drew important scientific conclusions. Let us take another example. In "Notes of a Publicist (On Ascending a High Mountain; The Harm of Despondency; The Utility of Trade; Attitude Toward the Mensheviks)," Lenin said: "I must confess to a mistake I made at the Third Congress of the Communist International also as a result of being overcautious...in general, the Mensheviks were absolutely wrong and they were, in fact, agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement. This fact is incontrovertible. But this incontrovertible fact does not eliminate the other fact that in individual cases the Mensheviks were right and the Bolsheviks wrong, as, for example, on the question of boycotting the Stolypin Duma in 1907." (Ibid., pp 598-599) He was not only able to consciously discover his own mistakes, he was also able to discover his opponents' correct opinions. What a thorough dialectical materialist!

In this article, we shall put emphasis on how Lenin treated wrong views. This is a question which often occurs in inner-party democratic life. In this regard, Lenin consciously adhered to the principle that the minority should submit to the majority. It is a commonplace phenomenon that differing opinions occur during studies and discussions. Lenin always tried to convince those who held wrong views by reasoning with them. When Lenin's correct opinion was rejected by the majority of the people who held wrong views, he always obeyed the decision of the majority--a principle of democratic centralism. However, he also enthusiastically

tried to convince the majority of the people to rapidly rectify the erroneous decision. The signing of the Brest peace treaty was an obvious example. At that time, the old Russian Army was not strong enough to resist the fully armed German forces and the young Soviet regime had not established its own army. If the war continued under these circumstances, the proletarian regime would be in danger of complete collapse. Thus, Lenin thought that, despite the harsh terms, a treaty had to be signed. Although this problem was of great urgency, Lenin still solved it according to the principle of democracy. When the delegation to the Brest conference asked for Lenin's instructions, Lenin said: "Stalin is not here, I have not told him about this.... I would like to consult Stalin before answering your questions." Later, he told the delegation: "Stalin has come; I will give you a common answer after our discussion." On the morning of 18 February 1918, the Bolshevik party Central Committee held a meeting. Lenin resolutely demanded that a telegram be sent to the Germans to ask for peace. However, Bukharin and some others objected to this correct decision. They stubbornly insisted: "The German Army dares not attack." Consequently, Lenin's motion was voted down by six votes against five. Several hours later, the German Army launched an attack on all fronts. Even at such an "extremely critical moment," Lenin would not insist on his proposal. As a member of the collective, he upheld the principle that the minority should be subordinate to the majority. It was not until the majority of the committee members at the central conference agreed with Lenin's correct proposal that Lenin told the German Government, on behalf of the People's Committee, that he agreed to sign a peace treaty. As the German imperialists knew the weaknesses of the Soviet forces, they did not give any reply. Instead, they continued to launch attacks. On 21 February, there was no alternative but for Lenin to announce on behalf of the People's Committee: "The socialist mother country is in crisis!" This announcement was an attempt to mobilize the tired workers and peasants so that they would fight fearlessly against the German troops. However, the German troops had seized large quantities of stockpiled strategic materials. On 22 February, Germany proposed even harsher terms. The outcome proved that Lenin's predictions were completely correct, while those of Bukharin and others were completely wrong and dangerous. Their stance had grave consequences. However, Lenin did not punish anyone for this.

The reason is simple. If people are condemned when they say something wrong, how can there be democracy and unity? Forbidding people to make mistakes is similar to thinking that one will never make mistakes. It is not a view of Marxist dialectical materialism. People who express erroneous views during open discussions should not be condemned because their problems are of the nature of ideological understanding rather than that of conspiracy. Only in this way can we achieve unity on the basis of correct thinking through free discussions, through criticism and self-criticism, and through distinguishing between right and wrong on the question of ideology.

Not only in his articles and words, but also in practice, Lenin recognized party members' democratic rights to express opinions. He also forbade people to seek privileges. Therefore, he never attacked and persecuted anyone who raised an opposite view. On the contrary, he united some people who had long been opposing him and had been proved to be wrong in practice. These people never left Lenin

because they held differing views. On the contrary, they worked enthusiastically under Lenin's leadership. Lenin practiced the principle of "say all you know and say it without reserve" and "blame not the speaker but be warned by his words." He earnestly implemented the principle of democratic centralism so that a lively political situation in which there was both democracy and centralism emerged in the party. Thus, full play was given to every comrade's wisdom and talent, difficulties were overcome one by one and smooth development of the new socialist cause was insured.

Lenin bitterly hated those who deliberately attacked others or even framed others by fabrication. At the same time, he sharply criticized and severely blamed bureaucratic leaders who adopted a dilatory work style, who lacked a sense of responsibility, who did not go deep enough to have a good understanding of the situation and did not pay attention to the masses. Lenin pointed out: "Our program also declares the struggle against red tape as one of the most important tasks. We will carry on this struggle in all offices and departments by every means." ("Collected Works of Lenin," Vol 30, p 298) We "should adopt revolutionary measures to combat abuses and red tape." (Ibid., Vol 28, p 461) He also said that such a dilatory work style should be put on trial. Only in this way can we really cure the disease. Lenin energetically advocated democracy within the party, opposed red tape and unsavory tendencies. All revolutionaries, particularly those in leading positions, should earnestly and repeatedly learn from him.

Lenin not only practiced the principle of "blame not the speaker," he also enthusiastically helped comrades who made mistakes to realize their own mistakes and correct them, in order to unite better with them and to fight for the common cause. One of Lenin's secretaries (Ge lai sai er) [2706 5490 1049 1422] said: "Even when Lenin severely blamed a person, he never insulted or despised that person. On the contrary, he always helped that person build up confidence and believe in his own strength and ability to correct his mistakes. His wit, his attention, his concern and his comradely help showed when people were in difficulty, inspired those who had little ability, who were tired and who lacked confidence. He influenced them with his own confidence and vitality, his courage, his decisiveness, his wit and his efficiency. Moreover, his way of handling affairs and his farsightedness in what to do and how to do it often encouraged people to advance.

Lunacharskiy, who once made mistakes, recalled with deep personal feelings: "Lenin seldom lost his temper, particularly when he was on the People's Committee. However, when he lost his temper, he was really angry. He never hesitated in speech. Sometimes he even said such things as: 'The Soviet bureaucrats are completely out of their minds,' 'lazybones,' 'stupid fools' and some other abusive remarks. Such remarks occasionally occurred in his reports, telegrams and telephone conversations. However, no one felt unhappy because of these remarks."

After the death of Marx, Engels said: "I make bold to say that though he may have had many opponents he had hardly one personal enemy." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 3, p 576) This also applies to Lenin. He had waged various uncompromising struggles against all sorts of erroneous thinking

throughout his life. His opponents even criticized him because he was "fond of quarrelling, fault-finding and making a fuss over a trifling matter." However, Lenin may not have had even one personal enemy. We hold that: One's thinking is not innate, nor does it come into being out of the void. However, in the final analysis, it is the reflection of certain social and material living conditions. Similar to correct ideology, wrong ideology should not be attributed to one single person. Only when we make clear its social roots and ideological roots can we adopt effective measures for thoroughgoing reforms. This is the correct way of solving problems. Of course, this does not mean that those who make mistakes need not be held responsible. As long as wrong ideas have caused bad effects, no one has any reason to shirk responsibility and shift the blame onto others. However, as serious proletarian revolutionaries, we must seriously analyze the causes of the erroneous thinking and find out the correct methods to overcome such thinking so that they may become the guide to correct thinking. Only in this way can we say that we have done our best.

Thus, proletarian leaders are able to correctly handle differing views not only because they have a world outlook of dialectical materialism and historical materialism but also because they have a strong sense of communist responsibility to liberate the whole of mankind. People who seek personal fame and high positions, who have an ugly soul and who ride roughshod over comrades who have made mistakes can never understand the spiritual world of these leaders. Only genuine Marxists can have a deep understanding and such a breadth of vision.

Comrade Zhou Enlai also set a brilliant example for us on the question of treating comrades who have made mistakes. He had a good understanding of Lenin's spirit. In "An Important Question in Leadership Style," he said: "We should not discriminate against comrades who have problems in their ideology and work style. Instead, we should trust them and do ideological work on them." "We must make a basic estimate of every comrade and see whether he is basically trustworthy or not." "If he is trustworthy, the party should trust him no matter how many mistakes he has made and no matter what is wrong with his ideology and work style. We must criticize his mistakes and trust him in order to correct his work style. Despite their serious mistakes, these people are basically good. Thus, we must trust them and grasp them firmly. We should not ignore them and be indifferent to them." "A leader must unite with those he dislikes and those he is unwilling to approach. He must grasp them firmly, praise their merits and criticize their demerits in order to remold their ideology. In this way, he will also reform his own leadership." ("Collected Works of Zhou Enlai," Vol 1, p 287) Comrade Zhou Enlai did what he said and practiced this Marxist principle throughout his life.

Our party has summed up the experience of party building and formulated the "Guiding Principles for Inner-Party Political Life" which stated: "Leading cadres who make use of their position and power for retaliation or who bring false charges against comrades because of personal grudges, adopt measures such as 'making things tough for them' and 'filing unfavorable statements against them' and punish these comrades for 'opposing the party,' 'opposing the leadership,' 'launching vicious attacks' and 'committing errors in political line' are acting in violation of the inner-party democratic system and revolutionary ethics and qualities. Those who make false charges of committing counterrevolutionary

crimes against comrades who dare to uphold truth, those who wantonly adopt the measures of dictatorship and those who carry out ruthless persecution are committing serious crimes against the law. They must be severely punished in accordance with party discipline and state laws." We must resolutely implement the "Guiding Principles for Inner-Party Political Life" so that differing views within the party can be safeguarded by the party discipline and state law. While reviewing Lenin's teachings and learning from Lenin's exemplary work style, we must act in accordance with the guiding principles of inner-party political life, develop democracy within the party, carry out criticism and self-criticism, practice collective leadership, earnestly improve party work style and strengthen and improve party leadership. At the same time, we must earnestly strengthen and perfect socialist democracy, consolidate the proletarian regime, fully mobilize the creativity and enthusiasm of all party members and all the Chinese people in order to fight for the building of a modern socialist power with a high degree of civilization.

CS0: 4004/118

CONSCIENTIOUSLY IMPLEMENT THE POLICY OF LETTING THE PEASANTS KEEP PRIVATE PLOTS ON HILLSIDES FOR GATHERING FIREWOOD

Beijing RED FLAG in Chinese No 6, 17 Mar 81 p 49

[Article by Li Zhankui [2621 0148 7608]]

[Text] Last year we went to 16 counties in Shaanxi, Ningxia, Gansu, Shanxi, Liaoning provinces and autonomous region to conduct an investigation on the problem of firewood and timber for peasants. We deeply feel that it is very important to the peasants' economic life to implement seriously in these regions the policy of letting peasants keep private plots on hillsides for gathering firewood in order to solve their problem of firewood and timber.

Vegetation in these regions has been destroyed and erosion is very serious. Natural disasters frequently occur. The output of grain and industrial crops is not high and the income of the commune members is relatively low. In addition, the peasants have difficulty in getting firewood and timber. Apart from a few places where the situation is slightly better because of the existence of some forests or coal mines nearby, the peasants in these regions do not have enough firewood.

Of course, there are also places where the problem of firewood has been properly solved. For example, in Yan'an and Yulin prefectures, it was stipulated in 1964 that commune members could keep private plots on hillsides for gathering firewood and could plant trees around their houses. Some communes and production brigades there stood up against the interference and sabotage of the ultra-"left" line and have stuck to this practice. In the Jingchang people's commune of Zhidan County, there are over 1,530 households with a total of over 9,400 people. Each household has been allotted 3 mu 6 fen for a private plot on the hillside for gathering firewood. Of these private plots, 7,100 mu are now covered with forests. Thus, 45 percent of the peasant households in the commune are self-sufficient in firewood and timber, and 37 percent of the households get half of the firewood they need from their plots. In the Majiatu production brigade of the Balasu people's commune, Yulin County, a portion of the barren beaches was allotted to commune members as private plots for gathering firewood and timber in 1966. Since then, it has been easy to look after the forests of the collective, and the problem of firewood for commune members has been solved.

Most of the mountainous districts and undulating areas of our country are thinly populated. Each person there can have an average of over 10 mu of land for his use. If we only implement seriously the policy of letting peasants keep private plots on hillsides for gathering firewood, we will have favorable conditions for solving the problem of firewood and timber for peasants in these areas. Facts have shown that there are many advantages in assigning to peasants private plots on hillsides for gathering firewood: (1) It is one of the fundamental ways to solve the problem of firewood and timber for peasants; (2) it helps to protect and develop forest resources and meadows of the state and the collectives; (3) once the problem of firewood for peasants is solved, the stalks of crops can be used as fertilizer for fields, which increases the soil fertility; (4) it facilitates the combination and mutual promotion of agriculture, forestry and animal husbandry.

In order to implement properly the policy of letting the peasants keep private plots on hillsides for gathering firewood, we must first solve the problem of the understanding of some cadres. According to our information, quite a few cadres, even some leading cadres lack a proper understanding of the necessity of implementing such a policy. Why do they lack a proper understanding of it? (1) They do not realize very well the urgency and importance of the peasants' need for private plots on hillsides for gathering firewood. Some peasants have criticized us, saying, "The leaders have been gone from the countryside (the old revolutionary base areas) for a long time and seldom come back. They do not know our difficulty of firewood shortage." (2) Some cadres have not yet gotten rid of the pernicious influence of the "left" deviationist line. In implementing the policy of private plots on hillsides for gathering firewood, they do not allot plots to peasants even when they can and they do not allot more plots to peasants even when they can. (3) There are still other cadres who underestimate the role played by scattered small plots of land. In some places in the mountainous districts, undulating areas and on plains, there are a number of scattered small plots of uncultivated land which are not utilized by the collectives and on which the commune members are not allowed to grow grass or to plant trees. (4) Some production teams in wooded mountain areas think that the firewood problem is easy to solve, so they do not let peasants have private plots on hillsides for gathering firewood.

As to what kind of tree should be planted on private plots on hillsides, we should proceed from the natural conditions in different localities such as soil, climate and so on. It is advisable to plant bushes and grow grass which grow fast and are suitable for the localities, such as purple-ear scholar tree, queer willow, sand brambles, thorn willow and so on. The characteristics of these bushes are that they are fast-growing, drought-enduring and frost-resistant and heat-resistant (a fairly high calorific value). It is better to have a mixed forest which can serve different purposes (source of firewood, oil, fodder, fertilizer, and so on).

In order to implement this economic policy of letting peasants keep private plots on hillsides for gathering firewood, we should carry out experiments in different localities and sum up the experiences. The state and the collectives should assist the peasants in managing properly private plots for gathering firewood, give them necessary technical guidance, and provide them with saplings in order to increase the output of firewood and to help the peasants fundamentally solve the problem of firewood and timber.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

May 5, 1981

D.S.